arXiv:1003.2179v1 [math.RT] 10 Mar 2010

REPRESENTATION THEORY OF RECTANGULAR FINITE W-ALGEBRAS

JONATHAN BROWN

Abstract. We classify the finite dimensional irreducible representations of rectangular finite W-algebras, i.e., the finite W-algebras $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a symplectic or orthogonal Lie algebra and $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ is a nilpotent element with Jordan blocks all the same size.

1. Introduction

This paper concerns the representation theory of the finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ associated to a nilpotent element e in a reductive Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. The main focus of this paper is the representation theory of the finite W-algebras associated to nilpotent elements in the symplectic or orthogonal Lie algebras whose Jordan blocks are all the same size. We refer to these simply as *rectangular* finite W-algebras.

The general definition of finite W-algebras is due to Premet in [P1], though in some cases they had been introduced much earlier by Lynch in [Ly] following Kostant's celebrated work on Whittaker modules in [K]. The terminology "finite W-algebra" comes from the mathematical physics literature, where finite W-algebras are the finite type analogs of the vertex W-algebras defined and studied for example by Kac, Roan, and Wakimoto in [KRW]. The precise identification between the definitions in [P1] and [KRW] was made only recently by D'Andrea, De Concini, De Sole, Heluani, and Kac in [D^{3}HK].

There are many remarkable connections between finite W-algebras and other areas of mathematics. The finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ possesses two natural filtrations, the *Kazhdan* and *loop* filtrations. The main structure theorem for finite W-algebras, proved in [P1] and reproved in [GG], is that the associated graded algebra to $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ with respect to the Kazhdan filtration is isomorphic to the coordinate algebra of the Slodowy slice, i.e. $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is a *quantization* of the Slodowy slice through the nilpotent orbit containing e. On the other hand, by [P2] the associated graded algebra with respect to the loop filtration is isomorphic to $U(\mathfrak{g}^e)$, the universal enveloping algebra of the centralizer of e in $\mathfrak{g}$. Because of this, the structure of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is intimately related to the invariant theory of the centralizer $\mathfrak{g}^e$. In [BB] this connection was used to construct a system of algebraically independent generators for the center of the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}^e)$ in the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$, giving a constructive proof of the freeness of this center (which had been established earlier by Panyushev, Premet and Yakimova in [PPY] by a different method) and also verifying [PPY, Conjecture 4.1].

The work of Premet in [P2, P3], Losev in [Lo1, Lo2], and Ginzburg in [Gi] has highlighted the importance of the study of finite dimensional representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$, revealing an intimate relationship with the theory of primitive ideals of the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ itself. At the heart of this connection is an equivalence of categories due to Skryabin in [Sk] between the category of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules and a certain category of generalized Whittaker modules for $\mathfrak{g}$. For other recent results about the representation theory of finite W-algebras see e.g. [Lo3], [Lo4], [Go], [GRU].

1.1. **Statement of the main results.** Throughout this paper we denote the general linear, symplectic, and orthogonal Lie algebras $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$, $\mathfrak{sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$, and $\mathfrak{so}_n(\mathbb{C})$ as $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $\mathfrak{g}_n^-$, and $\mathfrak{g}_n^-$ for short, assuming that n is even if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$. We will also need the following index set defined in terms of a positive integer n:

$$\mathcal{I}_n = \{1-n, 3-n, \dots, n-1\}.$$

Let Y_n^+ and Y_n^- denote the twisted Yangians associated to $\mathfrak{g}_n^+$ and $\mathfrak{g}_n^-$, respectively. These are certain associative algebras with generators $\{S_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$; see [MNO] for the full relations. Fix positive integers n and l, and a sign $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$, now let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{nl}^{\epsilon}$. Let e be a nilpotent element of Jordan type (l^n) in $\mathfrak{g}$. In order to ensure that such a nilpotent exists one must further assume that if $\epsilon = +$ and l is even then n is even, and that if $\epsilon = -$ and l is odd then n is even. Let $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ be the finite W-algebra attached to $\mathfrak{g}$ and the nilpotent element e; see §2.1 below for the general definition. We will also need another sign ϕ defined to be ϵ if l is odd, and $-\epsilon$ if l is even. Set $Y = Y_n^{\phi}$. The main result of [B1] is the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a surjective algebra homomorphism* $Y \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ *with kernel generated by the elements*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ S_{i,j}^{(r)} \,\middle|\, i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n, r > l \right\} && \text{if } l \text{ is even;} \\ &\left\{ S_{i,j}^{(r)} + \tfrac{\phi}{2} S_{i,j}^{(r-1)} \,\middle|\, i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n, r > l \right\} && \text{if } l \text{ is odd.} \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Results along these lines were first noticed by Ragoucy in [R], where he observed that a similar homomorphism exists in the case that l is odd for certain commutative analogs of these algebras.

The main aim of the present article is to combine this theorem with Molev's classification of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of twisted Yangians from [M] to deduce a classification of finite dimensional irreducible representations of the rectangular finite W-algebras. The main combinatorial objects in this classification are skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux. A *skew-symmetric* $n \times l$ *tableaux* is an $n \times l$ matrix of complex numbers, with rows labeled in order from top to bottom by the set $\mathcal{I}_n$ and columns labeled in order from left to right by the set $\mathcal{I}_l$, and which is skew-symmetric with respect to the center of the matrix, that is, if $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_l}$ is a skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux then $a_{i,j} = -a_{-i,-j}$. Let $\mathrm{Tab}_{n,l}$ denote the set of skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux. We say that two skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux are *row equivalent* if one can be obtained from the other by permuting entries within rows. Let $\mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ denote the set of row equivalence classes of skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux.

In the following definition (and from here on) we use the partial order $\geq$ on $\mathbb{C}$ defined by $a \geq b$ if $a - b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. A skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_l}$ is ϵ-*column strict* if

- the entries in every column except for the middle column (which exists only when l is odd) are strictly decreasing from top to bottom, i.e., $a_{1-n,j} > a_{3-n,j} > \cdots > a_{n-1,j}$ for all $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$;

- if l is odd and n is even then the entries in the middle column satisfy $a_{1-n,0} > a_{3-n,0} > \cdots > a_{-1,0}$, and they also satisfy $a_{-1,0} > 0$ if $\epsilon = -$, and they satisfy $a_{-3,0} + a_{-1,0} > 0$ if $\epsilon = +$ and $n \geq 4$;
- if l is odd and n is odd then the entries in the middle column satisfy $a_{1-n,0} > a_{3-n,0} > \cdots > a_{-2,0}$, and they also satisfy $2a_{-2,0} > 0$.

Let $\mathrm{Col}^{\epsilon}_{n,l}$ denote the set of all ϵ-column strict skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux, and let $\mathrm{Std}^{\epsilon}_{n,l}$ denote the set of elements of $\mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ which have a representative in $\mathrm{Col}^{\epsilon}_{n,l}$.

We relate these sets to certain representations of the twisted Yangian Y. It is convenient to use the power series

$$S_{i,j}(u) = \sum_{r \geq 0} S^{(r)}_{i,j} u^{-r} \in Y[[u^{-1}]], \tag{1.2}$$

where $S^{(0)}_{i,j} = \delta_{i,j}$. A Y-module V is called a *highest weight module* if it generated by a vector v such that $S_{i,j}(u)v = 0$ for all $i < j$ and if for all i we have that $S_{i,i}(u)v = \mu_i(u)v$ for some power series $\mu_i(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. To a skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in I_n, j \in I_l}$ we associate a (unique up to isomorphism) irreducible highest weight Y-module generated by a highest weight vector v for which

$$(u - \frac{i}{2})^l S_{i,i}(u - \frac{i}{2})v = (u + a_{i,1-l})(u + a_{i,3-l}) \dots (u + a_{i,l-1})v$$

if l is even and $i \geq 0$, or

$$\begin{aligned}
&(u - \frac{i}{2})^{l-1}(u + \frac{\phi - i}{2})S_{i,i}(u - \frac{i}{2})v \\
&\quad = (u + a_{i,1-l})(u + a_{i,3-l}) \dots (u + a_{i,-2})(u + a_{i,0} + \delta_{i,0}/2)(u + a_{i,2}) \dots (u + a_{i,l-1})v
\end{aligned}$$

if l is odd and $i \geq 0$. This Y-module factors through the surjection $Y \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ from Theorem 1.1 to yield a (not necessarily finite dimensional) irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module denoted $L(A)$ for each $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$. Moreover these are the only highest weight Y-modules which descend to $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$, so the problem of classifying the finite dimensional irreducible representations is reduced to determining exactly which $L(A)$'s are finite dimensional, which can be deduced from Molev's results in [M]. The following is the main theorem of this paper:

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose* $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$.

(i) *If l is odd or if l is even and $\epsilon = +$ then $L(A)$ is finite dimensional if and only if A has a representative in $\mathrm{Col}^{\epsilon}_{n,l}$. Hence*

$$\{L(A) \mid A \in \mathrm{Std}^{\epsilon}_{n,l}\}$$

is a complete set of isomorphism classes of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

(ii) *If l is even and $\epsilon = -$ then $L(A)$ is finite dimensional if and only if A^+ has a representative in $\mathrm{Col}^{+}_{n,l+1}$. Hence*

$$\{L(A) \mid A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}, A^+ \in \mathrm{Std}^{+}_{n,l+1}\}$$

is a complete set of isomorphism classes of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

In the theorem A^+ denotes the skew-symmetric $n \times (l+1)$ tableaux obtained by inserting a middle column into A with entries

$$\frac{n}{2}-1, \frac{n}{2}-2, \dots, 1, 0, 0, -1, -2, \dots, 1-\frac{n}{2}$$

if n is even and

$$\frac{n}{2}-1, \frac{n}{2}-2, \dots, \frac{1}{2}, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}, \dots, 1-\frac{n}{2}$$

if n is odd down the middle column.

The classification in Theorem 1.2 meshes well with the general framework of highest weight theory for finite W-algebras developed in [BGK]. Under this framework for each $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ one can associate an irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module. In §5 we show that this module is isomorphic to $L(A)$ for each $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$.

The theorem also helps illuminate the connection between $U(\mathfrak{g})$-modules and $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules via primitive ideals. For an algebra A let $\mathrm{Prim}\, A$ denote the set of primitive ideals in A. In [Lo2] Losev showed that there exists a surjective map

$$\dagger : \mathrm{Prim}_{\mathrm{fin}} U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \to \mathrm{Prim}_{\overline{G.e}} U(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Here G is the adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathrm{Prim}_{\mathrm{fin}} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ denotes the primitive ideals of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ of finite co-dimension, and

$$\mathrm{Prim}_{\overline{G.e}} U(\mathfrak{g}) = \{I \in \mathrm{Prim}\, U(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \mathcal{VA}(I) = \overline{G.e}\},$$

where $\mathcal{VA}(I)$ denotes the associated variety of an ideal I in $U(\mathfrak{g})$. Moreover, Losev showed that the fibers of the map $\dagger$ are C-orbits, where $C = C_G(e)/C_G(e)^\circ$ is the component group associated to the nilpotent element e, which acts naturally as automorphisms on $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ (induced ultimately by its adjoint action on $U(\mathfrak{g})$).

In our special cases we can calculate explicitly the action of C on the set of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules, and therefore on $\mathrm{Prim}_{\mathrm{fin}} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. By [C, Chapter 13] the only rectangular finite W-algebras for which C is not trivial are the ones where $\epsilon = -$, and n and l are both even, in which case $C \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. To explicitly state the C-action we need to define the notion of a $\sharp$-*special* element of a list of complex numbers. Given a list $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ of complex numbers let $\{(a_1^{(i)}, \dots, a_{2k+1}^{(i)}) \mid i \in I\}$ be the set of all permutations of this list which satisfy $a_{2j-1}^{(i)} + a_{2j}^{(i)} > 0$ for each $j = 1, \dots, k$. Assuming such rearrangements exist, we define the $\sharp$-*special element* of $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ to be the unique maximal element of the set $\{a_{2k+1}^{(i)} \mid i \in I\}$. On the other hand, if no such rearrangements exist, we say that the $\sharp$-special element of $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ is undefined. For example, the $\sharp$-special element of $(-3, -1, 2)$ is -3, whereas the $\sharp$-special element of $(-3, -2, 1)$ is undefined.

We define an action of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ on $\mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ as follows. Let $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_l} \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$, let a be the $\sharp$-special element of $(0, a_{-1,l-1}, a_{-1,l-3}, \dots, a_{-1,l-1})$, and let c denote the generator of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. If a is undefined or $a = 0$ then we declare that $c \cdot A = A$. Otherwise we declare that $c \cdot A = B$ where $B \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ has the same rows as A, except with one occurrence of a replaced with $-a$ in row -1, and one occurrence of $-a$ replaced with a in row 1. It is an immediate corollary of Lemma 3.19 below that this action is well defined. For example,

$$c \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline -3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline -4 & -2 & -1 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline -3 & -2 & 1 & 4 \\ \hline -4 & -1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

since the $\sharp$-special element of $(0, -3, 1, 2, 4)$ is 2.

In §6 we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that* n *and* l *are even positive integers and* $\epsilon = -$. *Let* $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n, j\in\mathcal{I}_l} \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ *be such that* $A^+ \in \mathrm{Std}^+_{n,l}$ *and let* $L(A)$ *denote the corresponding finite dimensional irreducible representation of* $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$. *Then the* $\sharp$*-special element of* $(0, a_{-1,l-1}, a_{-1,l-3}, \dots, a_{-1,l-1})$ *is defined, and* $c \cdot L(A) = L(c \cdot A)$.

Understanding the C-action for the rectangular finite W-algebras turns out to be key to understanding the C-action for more complicated finite W-algebras. In the forthcoming paper [BroG] we use these results as well as the results in [BGK] to classify the finite dimensional irreducible representations of $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ for a large class of nilpotent elements in the symplectic and orthogonal Lie algebras.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Jonathan Brundan for many enlightening conversations, and he would like to thank Simon Goodwin for pointing out and correcting an error in §6.

2. Rectangular finite W-algebras

2.1. **Overview of finite W-algebras.** Throughout this subsection $\mathfrak{g}$ denotes a reductive Lie algebra and e denotes a nilpotent element of $\mathfrak{g}$. To define the finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$, one first applies the Jacobson-Morozov Theorem to embed e into an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e,h,f). Now the ad h eigenspace decomposition gives a grading on $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i), \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{g}(i) = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h,x] = ix\}$. Finite W-algebras are defined for any grading, however to simplify the definition of $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$, we assume that this grading is an even grading, i.e., $\mathfrak{g}(i) = 0$ if i is odd. Define a character $\chi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $\chi(x) = (x,e)$, where $(.,.)$ is a fixed non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{m} = \bigoplus_{i<0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$, and let $\mathfrak{p} = \bigoplus_{i\geq 0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$. Let I be the left ideal of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by $\{m - \chi(m) \mid m \in \mathfrak{m}\}$. By the PBW Theorem,

$$U(\mathfrak{g}) = U(\mathfrak{p}) \oplus I. \tag{2.2}$$

Define $\mathrm{pr} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to U(\mathfrak{p})$ to be the projection along this direct sum decomposition. Now we define

$$U(\mathfrak{g},e) = \{u \in U(\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathrm{pr}([m,u]) = 0 \text{ for all } m \in \mathfrak{m}\},$$

so $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ is a subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{p})$ in these even grading cases.

The finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ possesses two natural filtrations. The first of these, the *Kazhdan filtration*, is the filtration on $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ induced by the filtration on $U(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by declaring that each element $x \in \mathfrak{g}(i)$ in the grading (2.1) is of degree $i+2$. The fundamental *PBW theorem* for finite W-algebras asserts that the associated graded algebra to $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ under the Kazhdan filtration is canonically isomorphic to the coordinate algebra of the Slodowy slice at e; see e.g. [GG, Theorem 4.1].

The second important filtration is called the *good filtration.* The good filtration is the filtration induced on $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ by the grading (2.1) on $U(\mathfrak{p})$. According to this definition, the associated graded algebra $\mathrm{gr}\, U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ is identified with a graded subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{p})$.

The fundamental result about the good filtration, which is a consequence of the PBW theorem and [P2, (2.1.2)], is that

$$\operatorname{gr} U(\mathfrak{g}, e) = U(\mathfrak{g}^e) \tag{2.3}$$

as graded subalgebras of $U(\mathfrak{p})$, where $\mathfrak{g}^e$ denotes the centralizer of e in $\mathfrak{g}$; see also [BGK, Theorem 3.5].

2.2. **Rectangular finite W-algebras and twisted Yangians.** Recall that a rectangular finite W-algebra is a finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ for which $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathfrak{so}_n(\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and e has Jordan blocks all the same size. We need to recall the many of the results from [B1] about the relationship between twisted Yangians and rectangular finite W-algebras. We begin by fixing explicit matrix realizations for the classical Lie algebras. Recall that for any integer $n \geq 1$, we have defined the index set $\mathcal{I}_n = \{1-n, 3-n, \dots, n-1\}$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_n = \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ with standard basis given by the matrix units $\{e_{i,j} \mid i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n\}$. Let J_n^+ be the $n \times n$ matrix with (i,j) entry equal to $\delta_{i,-j}$, and set

$$\mathfrak{g}_n^+ = \mathfrak{so}_n(\mathbb{C}) = \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_n \mid x^T J_n^+ + J_n^+ x = 0\},$$

where x^T denotes the usual transpose of an $n \times n$ matrix. Assuming in addition that n is even, let J_n^- be the $n \times n$ matrix with (i,j) entry equal to $\delta_{i,-j}$ if $j > 0$ and $-\delta_{i,-j}$ if $j < 0$, and set

$$\mathfrak{g}_n^- = \mathfrak{sp}_n(\mathbb{C}) = \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_n \mid x^T J_n^- + J_n^- x = 0\}. \tag{2.4}$$

We adopt the following convention regarding signs. For $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$, define $\hat{\imath} \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\hat{\imath} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \geq 0; \\ 1 & \text{if } i < 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

We will often identify a sign ± with the integer ±1 when writing formulae. For example, $\epsilon^{\hat{\imath}}$ denotes 1 if $\epsilon = +$ or $\hat{\imath} = 0$, and it denotes -1 if $\epsilon = -$ and $\hat{\imath} = 1$. With this notation, $\mathfrak{g}_n^\epsilon$ is spanned by the matrices $\{f_{i,j} \mid i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n\}$, where

$$f_{i,j} = e_{i,j} - \epsilon^{\hat{\imath}+\hat{\jmath}} e_{-j,-i}.$$

Next we fix integers $n, l \geq 1$ and signs $\epsilon, \phi \in \{\pm\}$, assuming that $\phi = \epsilon$ if l is odd, $\phi = -\epsilon$ if l is even, and $\phi = +$ if n is odd; now let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{nl}^\epsilon$. To define a nilpotent element $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ of Jordan type (l^n) we introduce an $n \times l$ rectangular array of boxes, labeling rows in order from top to bottom by the index set $\mathcal{I}_n$ and columns in order from left to right by the index set $\mathcal{I}_l$. Also label the individual boxes in the array with the elements of the set $\mathcal{I}_{nl}$. For $a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ we let $\operatorname{row}(a)$ and $\operatorname{col}(a)$ denote the row and column numbers of the box in which a appears. We require that the boxes are labeled skew-symmetrically in the sense that $\operatorname{row}(-a) = -\operatorname{row}(a)$ and $\operatorname{col}(-a) = -\operatorname{col}(a)$. If $\epsilon = -$ we require in addition that $a > 0$ either if $\operatorname{col}(a) > 0$ or if $\operatorname{col}(a) = 0$ and $\operatorname{row}(a) > 0$; this additional restriction streamlines some of the signs appearing in formulae below. For example, if $n = 3, l = 2$ and $\epsilon = -, \phi = +$, one could pick the labeling

-5	1
-3	3
-1	5

and get that $\operatorname{row}(1) = -2$ and $\operatorname{col}(1) = 1$. We remark that the above arrays are a special case of the *pyramids* introduced by Elashvili and Kac in [EK]; see also [BruG].

Having made these choices, we let $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ denote the following nilpotent matrix of Jordan type (l^n):

$$e = \sum_{\substack{a,b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{row}(a)=\mathrm{row}(b) \\ \mathrm{col}(a)+2=\mathrm{col}(b)\geq 2}} f_{a,b} + \sum_{\substack{a,b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{row}(a)=\mathrm{row}(b)>0 \\ \mathrm{col}(a)+2=\mathrm{col}(b)=1}} f_{a,b} + \sum_{\substack{a,b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{row}(a)=\mathrm{row}(b)=0 \\ \mathrm{col}(a)+2=\mathrm{col}(b)=1}} \tfrac{1}{2} f_{a,b}. \tag{2.6}$$

In the above example, $e = f_{-1,5} + \frac{1}{2} f_{-3,3} = e_{-1,5} + e_{-5,1} + e_{-3,3}$. Also define an even grading

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(r) \tag{2.7}$$

with $e \in \mathfrak{g}(2)$ by declaring that $\deg(f_{a,b}) = \mathrm{col}(b) - \mathrm{col}(a)$. Note this grading coincides with the grading obtained by embedding e into the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e, h, f) where

$$h = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}} \mathrm{col}(-a) e_{a,a} \tag{2.8}$$

and considering the $\mathrm{ad}\, h$-eigenspace decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{p} = \bigoplus_{r \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}(r)$ and $\mathfrak{m} = \bigoplus_{r<0} \mathfrak{g}(r)$. For the non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ we use the form $(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{tr}(xy)$. Define $\chi : \mathfrak{m} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $x \mapsto (e, x)$. An explicit calculation using the formula for the nilpotent matrix e recorded above shows that

$$\chi(f_{a,b}) = -\epsilon^{\hat{a}+\hat{b}} \chi(f_{-b,-a}) = 1 \tag{2.9}$$

if $\mathrm{row}(a) = \mathrm{row}(b), \mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) + 2$ and either $\mathrm{col}(a) \geq 2$ or $\mathrm{col}(a) = 1, \mathrm{row}(a) \geq 0$; all other $f_{a,b} \in \mathfrak{m}$ satisfy $\chi(f_{a,b}) = 0$. Now we have our rectangular finite W-algebra

$$U(\mathfrak{g}, e) = \{u \in U(\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathrm{pr}([x, u]) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathfrak{m}\}$$

where $\mathrm{pr} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to U(\mathfrak{p})$ is projection along the the decomposition from (2.2).

To make the connection between $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and the twisted Yangians, we exploit a shifted version of the Miura transform, which we define as follows. Let $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}(0)$ be the Levi factor of $\mathfrak{p}$ coming from the grading. It is helpful to bear in mind that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{h} \cong \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}_n^{\oplus m} & \text{if } l = 2m; \\ \mathfrak{g}_n^{\epsilon} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_n^{\oplus m} & \text{if } l = 2m+1, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

which maps $f_{a,b} \in \mathfrak{h}$ to $f_{\mathrm{row}(a),\mathrm{row}(b)} \in \mathfrak{g}_n^{\epsilon}$ if $\mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) = 0$ or to $e_{\mathrm{row}(a),\mathrm{row}(b)}$ in the $\lceil \frac{\mathrm{col}(a)}{2} \rceil$th copy of $\mathfrak{g}_n$ if $\mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) > 0$. For $q \in \mathcal{I}_l$, let

$$\rho_q = \begin{cases} \frac{nq-\epsilon}{2} & \text{if } q > 0; \\ \frac{nq+\epsilon}{2} & \text{if } q < 0; \\ 0 & \text{if } q = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

Let η be the automorphism of $U(\mathfrak{h})$ defined on generators by $\eta(f_{a,b}) = f_{a,b} - \delta_{a,b} \rho_{\mathrm{col}(a)}$. Let $\xi : U(\mathfrak{p}) \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{h})$ be the algebra homomorphism induced by the natural projection $\mathfrak{p} \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{h}$. The *Miura transform* $\mu : U(\mathfrak{p}) \to U(\mathfrak{h})$ is the composite map

$$\mu = \eta \circ \xi. \tag{2.12}$$

By [Ly, §2.3] (or [B1, Theorem 3.4]) the restriction of μ to $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is injective.

Now we turn our attention to the twisted Yangian $Y = Y_n^{\phi}$, recalling that $\phi = -\epsilon$ if l is even and $\phi = \epsilon$ if l is odd. By definition, Y is a subalgebra of the Yangian Y_n.

The Yangian Y_n is a Hopf algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ with countably many generators $\{T_{i,j}^{(r)} \,|\, i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$. To give the defining relations and other data for the Yangian it is convenient to use the power series

$$T_{i,j}(u) = \sum_{r \geq 0} T_{i,j}^{(r)} u^{-r} \in Y_n[[u^{-1}]]$$

where $T_{i,j}^{(0)} = \delta_{i,j}$. Now the defining relations are

$$(u-v)[T_{i,j}(u), T_{k,l}(u)] = T_{k,j}(u)T_{i,l}(v) - T_{k,j}(v)T_{i,l}(u).$$

This and subsequent formulae involving generating functions should be interpreted by equating coefficients of the indeterminates u and v on both sides of equations, as discussed in detail in [MNO, §1]. For example, the comultiplication $\Delta : Y_n \to Y_n \otimes Y_n$ making Y_n into a Hopf algebra is defined by the formula

$$\Delta(T_{i,j}(u)) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_n} T_{i,k}(u) \otimes T_{k,j}(u). \tag{2.13}$$

By [MNO, §3.4], there exists an automorphism $\tau : Y_n \to Y_n$ of order 2 defined by

$$\tau(T_{i,j}(u)) = \phi^{\hat{i}+\hat{j}} T_{-j,-i}(-u).$$

We define the twisted Yangian Y to be the subalgebra of Y_n generated by the elements $\{S_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$ coming from the expansion

$$S_{i,j}(u) = \sum_{r \geq 0} S_{i,j}^{(r)} u^{-r} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_n} \tau(T_{i,k}(u)) T_{k,j}(u) \in Y_n[[u^{-1}]]. \tag{2.14}$$

This is not the same embedding of Y into Y_n as used in [MNO, §3]: we have twisted the embedding there by the automorphism τ. The relations for the twisted Yangian are given by

$$\begin{aligned}(u^2 - v^2)[S_{i,j}(u), S_{k,l}(v)] = {} & (u+v)(S_{k,j}(u)S_{i,l}(v) - S_{k,j}(v)S_{i,l}(u)) - \\ & (u-v)(\phi^{\hat{k}+\widehat{-j}} S_{i,-k}(u)S_{-j,l}(v) - \phi^{\hat{k}+\widehat{-l}} S_{k,-i}(v)S_{-l,j}(u)) + \\ & \phi^{\hat{i}+\widehat{-j}} S_{k,-i}(u)S_{-j,l}(v) - \phi^{\hat{i}+\widehat{-j}} S_{k,-i}(v)S_{-j,l}(u)\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\phi^{\hat{i}+\hat{j}} S_{-j,-i}(-u) = S_{i,j}(u) + \phi \frac{S_{i,j}(u) - S_{i,j}(-u)}{2u}. \tag{2.16}$$

Because of the fact that τ is a coalgebra antiautomorphism of Y_n, we get from [MNO, §4.17] that the restriction of Δ to Y has image contained in $Y \otimes Y_n$ and

$$\Delta(S_{i,j}(u)) = \sum_{h,k \in \mathcal{I}_n} S_{h,k}(u) \otimes \tau(T_{i,h}(u))T_{k,j}(u). \tag{2.17}$$

We let $\Delta^{(m)} : Y_n \to Y_n^{\otimes(m+1)}$ denote the mth iterated comultiplication. The preceding formula shows that it maps Y into $Y \otimes Y_n^{\otimes m}$.

By [MNO, §1.16] there is an evaluation homomorphism $Y_n \to U(\mathfrak{g}_n)$. In view of this and (2.10), we obtain for every $0 < p \in \mathcal{I}_l$ a homomorphism

$$\mathrm{ev}_p : Y_n \to U(\mathfrak{h}), \qquad T_{i,j}(u) \mapsto \delta_{i,j} + u^{-1} f_{a,b}, \tag{2.18}$$

where $a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ are defined from $\mathrm{row}(a) = i, \mathrm{row}(b) = j$ and $\mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) = p$. The image of this map is contained in the subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{h})$ generated by the $\lceil p/2 \rceil$th copy of $\mathfrak{g}_n$ from the decomposition (2.10). There is also an evaluation homomorphism $Y \to U(\mathfrak{g}_n^{\phi})$ defined in [MNO, §3.11]. If we assume that l is odd (so $\epsilon = \phi$), we can therefore define another homomorphism

$$\mathrm{ev}_0 : Y \to U(\mathfrak{h}), \qquad S_{i,j}(u) \mapsto \delta_{i,j} + (u + \tfrac{\phi}{2})^{-1} f_{a,b}, \tag{2.19}$$

where $\mathrm{row}(a) = i, \mathrm{row}(b) = j$ and $\mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) = 0$; if $\epsilon = -$ this depends on our convention for labeling boxes as specified above. The image of this map is contained in the subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{h})$ generated by the subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_n^{\epsilon}$ in the decomposition (2.10). Putting all these things together, we deduce that there is a homomorphism

$$\kappa_l : Y \to U(\mathfrak{h})$$

defined by

$$\kappa_l = \begin{cases} \mathrm{ev}_1 \mathbin{\bar\otimes} \mathrm{ev}_3 \mathbin{\bar\otimes} \cdots \mathbin{\bar\otimes} \mathrm{ev}_{l-1} \circ \Delta^{(m)} & \text{if } l = 2m+2; \\ \mathrm{ev}_0 \mathbin{\bar\otimes} \mathrm{ev}_2 \mathbin{\bar\otimes} \cdots \mathbin{\bar\otimes} \mathrm{ev}_{l-1} \circ \Delta^{(m)} & \text{if } l = 2m+1, \end{cases} \tag{2.20}$$

where $\bar\otimes$ indicates composition with the natural multiplication in $U(\mathfrak{h})$.

Theorem 1.1 is a corollary of the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1 ([B1, Theorem 1.1])**.** $\mu(U(\mathfrak{g}, e)) = \kappa_l(Y)$.

This implies the following:

Corollary 2.2. *When l is even there is a surjection*

$$\zeta : U(\mathfrak{g}', e') \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$$

where $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}_{n(l+1)}^{-\epsilon}$ and e' is a nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}'$ of Jordan type $((l+1)^n)$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r, "\kappa_{l+1}"] \arrow[dr, "\kappa_l"'] & U(\mathfrak{g}', e') \arrow[d, "\zeta"] \\ & U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \end{tikzcd}$$

Note that this corollary does not apply when $\epsilon = +$ and n is odd since in this case the nilpotents e and e' do not exist.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 requires an explicit formula for the generators of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ corresponding to the elements $S_{i,j}^{(r)} \in Y$, which we will use again later on. Given $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{I}_l$, let a, b be the elements of $\mathcal{I}_{nl}$ such that $\mathrm{col}(a) = p$, $\mathrm{col}(b) = q$, $\mathrm{row}(a) = i$, and $\mathrm{row}(b) = j$. Define a linear map $s_{i,j} : \mathfrak{g}_l \to \mathfrak{g}$ by setting

$$s_{i,j}(e_{p,q}) = \phi^{\hat{i}\hat{p} + \hat{j}\hat{q}} f_{a,b}. \tag{2.21}$$

Let M_n denote the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathbb{C}$, with rows and columns labeled by the index set $\mathcal{I}_n$ as usual, and let $T(\mathfrak{g}_l)$ be the tensor algebra on the vector space $\mathfrak{g}_l$. Let

$$s : T(\mathfrak{g}_l) \to M_n \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}) \tag{2.22}$$

be the algebra homomorphism that maps a generator $x \in \mathfrak{g}_l$ to $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n} e_{i,j} \otimes s_{i,j}(x)$. This in turn defines linear maps

$$s_{i,j} : T(\mathfrak{g}_l) \to U(\mathfrak{g}) \tag{2.23}$$

such that

$$s(x) = \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n} e_{i,j} \otimes s_{i,j}(x)$$

for every $x \in T(\mathfrak{g}_l)$. Note for any $x, y \in T(\mathfrak{g}_l)$ that

$$s_{i,j}(xy) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_n} s_{i,k}(x) s_{k,j}(y) \tag{2.24}$$

and also $s_{i,j}(1) = \delta_{i,j}$.

If A is an $l \times l$ matrix with entries in some ring, we define its *row determinant* $\operatorname{rdet} A$ to be the usual Laplace expansion of determinant, but keeping the (not necessarily commuting) monomials that arise in *row order*; see e.g. [BK1, (12.5)]. For $q \in \mathcal{I}_l$ and an indeterminate u, let

$$u_q = u + e_{q,q} + \rho_q \in T(\mathfrak{g}_l)[u],$$

recalling the definition of ρ_q from (2.11). Define $\Omega(u)$ to be the $l \times l$ matrix with entries in $T(\mathfrak{gl}_l)[u]$ whose (p, q) entry for $p, q \in \mathcal{I}_l$ is equal to

$$\Omega(u)_{p,q} = \begin{cases} e_{p,q} & \text{if } p < q; \\ u_q & \text{if } p = q; \\ -1 & \text{if } p = q+2 < 0; \\ -\phi & \text{if } p = q+2 = 0; \\ 1 & \text{if } p = q+2 > 0; \\ 0 & \text{if } p > q+2. \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

If l is odd we also need the $l \times l$ matrix $\bar{\Omega}(u)$ defined by

$$\bar{\Omega}(u)_{p,q} = \begin{cases} \Omega(u)_{p,q} & \text{if } p \neq 0 \text{ or } q \neq 0; \\ e_{0,0} & \text{if } p = q = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.26}$$

See [B1, §1] for examples of $\Omega(u)$ and $\bar{\Omega}(u)$. Now let

$$\omega(u) = \sum_{r=-\infty}^{l} \omega_{l-r} u^r = \begin{cases} \operatorname{rdet} \Omega(u) & \text{if } l \text{ is even;} \\ \operatorname{rdet} \Omega(u) + \displaystyle\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} (-2\phi u)^{-r} \operatorname{rdet} \bar{\Omega}(u) & \text{if } l \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{2.27}$$

This defines elements $\omega_r \in T(\mathfrak{g}_l)$, hence elements $s_{i,j}(\omega_r) \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ and $r \geq 1$. It is obvious from the definition that each $s_{i,j}(\omega_r)$ actually belongs to $U(\mathfrak{p})$.

Theorem 2.3 ([B1, Theorem 1.2])**.** *The elements* $\{s_{i,j}(\omega_r) \mid i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n, r \geq 1\}$ *generate the subalgebra* $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. *Moreover,* $\mu(s_{i,j}(\omega_r)) = \kappa_l(S_{i,j}^{(r)})$.

It will be useful to note this theorem implies that for all $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$

$$s_{i,j}(u^{-l}\omega(u)) = \kappa_l(S_{i,j}(u)). \tag{2.28}$$

3. Representation theory of Yangians and twisted Yangians

To prove Theorem 1.2 we need to review the representation theory of Yangians and twisted Yangians from [M].

3.1. **Representation theory of Yangians.** We say a Y_n-module V is a *highest weight module* if it is generated by a vector v such that $T_{i,j}(u)v = 0$ for all $i < j$, and if for all i we have that $T_{i,i}(u)v = \lambda_i(u)v$ for some power series $\lambda_i \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$, in which case we say that V is of highest weight

$$\bar{\lambda}(u) = (\lambda_{1-n}(u), \lambda_{3-n}(u), \dots, \lambda_{n-1}(u)). \tag{3.1}$$

For the rest of this paper we consider $\bar{\lambda}(u) \in (1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^n$ to be indexed by the set $\mathcal{I}_n$ as in (3.1).

The following theorem is contained in [M, §2].

Theorem 3.1. *For each weight $\bar{\lambda}(u) \in (1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^n$ there is a unique (up to isomorphism) irreducible highest weight Y_n-module $L(\bar{\lambda}(u))$ of highest weight $\bar{\lambda}(u)$.*

Theorem 3.2 ([M, Theorem 2.3]). *Every irreducible finite dimensional Y_n-module is a highest weight module.*

To specify which irreducible highest weight modules are finite dimensional, following Molev, we introduce the following notation. Given two power series $\lambda_1(u), \lambda_2(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ we write $\lambda_1(u) \to \lambda_2(u)$ if there exists a monic polynomial $P(u) \in \mathbb{C}[u]$ such that

$$\frac{\lambda_1(u)}{\lambda_2(u)} = \frac{P(u+1)}{P(u)}.$$

In fact $P(u)$ must then be unique because if $Q(u)$ is another monic polynomial satisfying $\frac{\lambda_1(u)}{\lambda_2(u)} = \frac{Q(u+1)}{Q(u)}$ then $\frac{Q(u)}{P(u)} = \frac{Q(u+1)}{P(u+1)}$, thus $\frac{Q(u)}{P(u)}$ is periodic, which implies $P(u) = Q(u)$.

Here is the main classification theorem for finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y_n.

Theorem 3.3 (Drinfeld, [Dr]). *The Y_n-module $L(\bar{\lambda}(u))$ is finite dimensional if and only if $\lambda_{1-n}(u) \to \lambda_{3-n}(u) \to \cdots \to \lambda_{n-1}(u)$.*

The following lemmas give a more combinatorial description of this notation. Recall that $\geq$ denotes the partial order on $\mathbb{C}$ where $a \geq b$ if $a - b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Lemma 3.4. *If $\lambda_1(u), \lambda_2(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ then $\lambda_1(u) \to \lambda_2(u)$ if and only if there exists $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ such that*

$$\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u) = (1 + a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + a_ku^{-1}),$$
$$\gamma(u)\lambda_2(u) = (1 + b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + b_ku^{-1})$$

where $a_i \geq b_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. First assume that $\lambda_1(u) \to \lambda_2(u)$, so there exists a monic polynomial $P(u)$ such that

$$\frac{\lambda_1(u)}{\lambda_2(u)} = \frac{P(u+1)}{P(u)}.$$

Let k be the degree of $P(u)$, and let $\gamma(u) = \frac{P(u)u^{-k}}{\lambda_2(u)}$. So $\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u) = P(u+1)u^{-k}$ and $\gamma(u)\lambda_2(u) = P(u)u^{-k}$, thus $\gamma(u)$ satisfies the conclusions of the lemma since we can now write $\gamma(u)\lambda_2(u)u^k = P(u) = (u + b_1) \dots (u + b_k)$ and $\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u)u^k = P(u+1) = (u + b_1 + 1) \dots (u + b_k + 1)$.

Now assume there exists $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ such that $\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u) = (1 + a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + a_ku^{-1})$ and $\gamma(u)\lambda_2(u) = (1 + b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + b_ku^{-1})$ where $a_i \geq b_i$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$. For $i = 1, \dots, k$ let $P_i(u) = (u + a_i - 1)(u + a_i - 2) \dots (u + b_i + 1)$. Now

$$\frac{\lambda_1(u)}{\lambda_2(u)} = \frac{(u + a_1)P_1(u) \dots (u + a_k)P_k(u)}{P_1(u)(u + b_1) \dots P_k(u)(u + b_k)},$$

so $P(u) = P_1(u)(u + b_1) \dots P_k(u)(u + b_k)$ is the unique polynomial satisfying

$$\frac{\lambda_1(u)}{\lambda_2(u)} = \frac{P(u + 1)}{P(u)}.$$

□

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $\lambda_1(u), \lambda_2(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$, *and suppose that* $\lambda_1(u) \to \lambda_2(u)$. *If* $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ *satisfies* $\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u), \gamma(u)\lambda_2(u) \in \mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ *then we can write* $\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u) = (1 + a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + a_ku^{-1})$ *and* $\gamma(u)\lambda_2(u) = (1 + b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + b_ku^{-1})$ *where* $a_i \geq b_i$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. We can write $\gamma(u)\lambda_1(u) = (1 + a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + a_ku^{-1})$ and $\gamma(u)\lambda_2(u) = (1 + b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + b_ku^{-1})$, and by replacing $\gamma(u)$ we may assume that the sets $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ are disjoint. By Lemma 3.4 there exists $\gamma'(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ such that $\gamma'(u)\lambda_1(u) = (1 + c_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_mu^{-1})$ and $\gamma'(u)\lambda_2(u) = (1 + d_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + d_mu^{-1})$ where $c_i \geq d_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and by replacing $\gamma'(u)$ we may assume that the sets $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ and $\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ are disjoint. So we have that

$$\frac{(1 + a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + a_ku^{-1})}{(1 + b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + b_ku^{-1})} = \frac{(1 + c_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_mu^{-1})}{(1 + d_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + d_mu^{-1})}.$$

So $k = m$, and as unordered sets we have $(a_1, \dots, a_k) = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$, and $(b_1, \dots, b_k) = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$. Thus the lemma follows by re-indexing $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_k)$. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $\lambda_1(u), \dots \lambda_m(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. *If* $\lambda_1(u) \to \lambda_2(u) \to \cdots \to \lambda_m(u)$ *then there exists* $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ *such that* $\gamma(u)\lambda_i(u) \in \mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Proof. Assume that $\lambda_1(u) \to \lambda_2(u) \to \cdots \to \lambda_m(u)$, and for $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$ let $P_i(u)$ be the monic polynomial so that

$$\frac{\lambda_i(u)}{\lambda_{i+1}(u)} = \frac{P_i(u + 1)}{P_i(u)}.$$

Note for $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$ that

$$\lambda_i(u) = \frac{P_i(u + 1)P_{i+1}(u + 1) \dots P_{m-1}(u + 1)\lambda_m(u)}{P_i(u)P_{i+1}(u) \dots P_{m-1}(u)}.$$

So

$$\gamma(u) = \frac{u^{-k}P_1(u) \dots P_{m-1}(u)}{\lambda_m(u)},$$

where $k = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \deg(P_i(u))$, satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. □

3.2. **Representation theory of twisted Yangians.**

Recall that a Y-module V is called a *highest weight module* if it generated by a vector v such that $S_{i,j}(u)v = 0$ for all $i < j$ and if for all i we have that $S_{i,i}(u)v = \mu_i(u)v$ for some power series $\mu_i(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. The following theorem is contained in [M, Chapter 3].

Theorem 3.7. *For a weight* $\bar{\mu}(u) = (\mu_1(u), \mu_3(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u)) \in (1+u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{n/2}$ *if* n *is even or* $\bar{\mu}(u) = (\mu_0(u), \mu_2(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u)) \in (1+u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{(n+1)/2}$ *if* n *is odd, there is a unique (up to isomorphism) irreducible highest weight* Y*-module* $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ *of highest weight* $\bar{\mu}(u)$.

For the rest of this paper we consider $\bar{\mu}(u) \in (1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{n/2}$ if n is even or $\bar{\mu}(u) \in (1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{(n+1)/2}$ if n is odd to be indexed by the sets $\{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\{0, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, respectively, as in Theorem 3.7.

The following is part of [M, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 3.8. *Every irreducible finite dimensional* Y*-module is a highest weight module.*

Following Molev, to specify which irreducible highest weight modules are finite dimensional, we introduce the following notation. For power series $\mu(u), \nu(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$, we write $\mu(u) \Rightarrow \nu(u)$ if there exists a monic polynomial $P(u) \in \mathbb{C}[u]$ such that $P(u) = P(1-u)$ and

$$\frac{\mu(u)}{\nu(u)} = \frac{P(u+1)}{P(u)}.$$

Note that $P(u) = P(1-u)$ is equivalent to $P(u)$ being of even degree and the roots of $P(u)$ being symmetric about $\frac{1}{2}$.

Here is the classification of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y_n^-:

Theorem 3.9 ([M, Theorem 4.8])**.** *The* Y_n^-*-module* $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ *is finite dimensional if and only if*

$$\mu_1(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1(u) \to \mu_3(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u).$$

To obtain a more combinatorial description of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y_n^-, we prove the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.10. *If* $\mu(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ *then* $\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$ *if and only if there exists* $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ *such that* $\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1})(1 - a_2u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})$ *where*

$$a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Assume $\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$, so there exists a monic polynomial $P(u)$ of even degree so that $P(u) = P(1-u)$ and

$$\frac{\mu(-u)}{\mu(u)} = \frac{P(u+1)}{P(u)}.$$

Let $2k$ be the degree of $P(u)$, and let

$$\gamma(u) = \frac{P(u)u^{-2k}}{\mu(u)}.$$

So $\gamma(u)\mu(-u) = P(u+1)u^{-2k}$ and $\gamma(u)\mu(u) = P(u)u^{-2k}$. Since the roots of $P(u)$ are symmetric about $\frac{1}{2}$, we can write

$$\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - b_1u^{-1})(1 - (1 - b_1)u^{-1}) \dots (1 - b_ku^{-1})(1 - (1 - b_k)u^{-1}).$$

Now it is clear that $\gamma(u)\mu(u)$ satisfies (3.2), so it remains to see that $\gamma(u) \in \mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$. Note that the roots of $P(u+1) = u^{2k}\gamma(u)\mu(-u)$ are $b_1 - 1, -b_1, \dots, b_k - 1, -b_k$. Now since these are also the roots of $P(-u) = u^{2k}\gamma(-u)\mu(-u)$, we have that $\gamma(-u)\mu(-u) = \gamma(u)\mu(-u)$, so $\gamma(-u) = \gamma(u)$, and thus $\gamma(u) \in \mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$.

Conversely, we now assume that there exists $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ such that $\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1})(1 - a_2u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})$, where $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $P_i(u) = (u + a_{2i-1} - 1)(u + a_{2i-1} - 2) \dots (u - a_{2i} + 1)$, and let $Q_i(u) = (u + a_{2i} - 1)(u + a_{2i} - 2) \dots (u - a_{2i-1} + 1)$. Now it is the case that

$$\frac{\mu(-u)}{\mu(u)} = \frac{(u + a_1)P_1(u)(u + a_2)Q_1(u) \dots (u + a_{2k-1})P_k(u)(u + a_{2k})Q_k(u)}{P_1(u)(u - a_2)Q_1(u)(u - a_1) \dots P_k(u)(u - a_{2k})Q_k(u)(u - a_{2k-1})},$$

so $P(u) = P_1(u)(u - a_2)Q_1(u)(u - a_1) \dots P_k(u)(u - a_{2k})Q_k(u)(u - a_{2k-1})$ is the unique monic polynomial of even degree such that $P(u) = P(1 - u)$ and

$$\frac{\mu(-u)}{\mu(u)} = \frac{P(u + 1)}{P(u)}.$$

□

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose that* $\mu(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$, $\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$, *and there exists* $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ *such that* $\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1})(1 - a_2u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})$ *where* $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, k$. *Then there exists* $\gamma'(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ *such that after re-indexing* $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k})$ *we can write* $\gamma'(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1})(1 - a_2u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2m}u^{-1})$ *where* $m \leq k$, *for each* $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, 2m\}$ *we have that* $a_i \neq -a_j$, *and* $(a_1, \dots, a_{2m})$ *satisfies* $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on k, and assume that $a_i = -a_j$ for some $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, 2k\}$. After re-indexing we may assume that $a_1 = -a_2$ or $a_1 = -a_3$. If $a_1 = -a_2$ then

$$\frac{\gamma(u)\mu(u)}{1 - a_1^2u^{-2}} = (1 - a_3u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})$$

satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma, so the lemma follows by induction. If $a_1 = -a_3$ then we have that $a_2 + a_4 = a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 \geq 0$, so

$$\frac{\gamma(u)\mu(u)}{1 - a_1^2u^{-2}} = (1 - a_2u^{-1})(1 - a_4u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})$$

satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma, so the lemma follows by induction. □

Lemma 3.12. *Let* $\mu(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. *If* $\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$ *and* $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ *is such that* $\gamma(u)\mu(u) \in \mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ *then we can write* $\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1})(1 - a_2u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})$ *so that* $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. By Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 there exists $\gamma'(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ such that $\gamma'(u)\mu(u) = (1 - b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - b_{2m}u^{-1})$ so that $b_i \neq -b_j$ for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, 2m\}$ and so that $b_{2i-1} + b_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Write

$$\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_pu^{-1})(1 - a_{p+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1 - a_q^2u^{-2})$$

such that $a_i \neq -a_j$ for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Thus

$$\frac{\gamma(u)}{\gamma'(u)} = \frac{(1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_pu^{-1})(1 - a_{p+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1 - a_q^2u^{-2})}{(1 - b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - b_{2m}u^{-1})}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}&(1-a_1u^{-1})\dots(1-a_pu^{-1})(1+b_1u^{-1})\dots(1+b_{2m}u^{-1})\\&=\frac{\gamma(u)(1-b_1^2u^{-2})\dots(1-b_{2m}^2u^{-2})}{\gamma'(u)(1-a_{p+1}^2u^{-2})\dots(1-a_q^2u^{-2})}\in\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]],\end{aligned}$$

and thus $p=2m$ and after re-indexing we must have that $a_i=b_i$ for all $i\in\{1,\dots,2m\}$. □

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\mu_1(u),\mu_2(u),\dots,\mu_m(u)\in 1+u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. Suppose $\mu_1(-u)\Rightarrow\mu_1(u)\to\mu_2(u)\to\dots\to\mu_m(u)$. Then there exists $\gamma(u)\in 1+u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ such that $\gamma(u)\mu_i(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ for $i=1,\dots,m$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.6 there exists $\upsilon(u)\in 1+u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ such that $\upsilon(u)\mu_i(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$. So we can write $\upsilon(u)\mu_1(u)=(1+b_1u^{-1})\dots(1+b_su^{-1})$. Let $\upsilon'(u)=\upsilon(u)(1-b_1u^{-1})\dots(1-b_su^{-1})$, so $\upsilon'(u)\mu_1(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-2}]$, and $\upsilon'(u)\mu_i(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ for $i=1,\dots,m$. By Lemma 3.10 there exists $\eta(u)\in 1+u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ such that $\eta(u)\mu_1(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$. Let $\gamma(u)=\eta(u)\upsilon'(u)\mu_1(u)$. Now $\gamma(u)\in 1+u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ and $\gamma(u)\mu_i(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ for $i=1,\dots,m$. □

This lemma is key to giving a more combinatorial description of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y which is done (in the context of representations of finite W-algebras) in §4 below.

Next we turn our attention to the classification of finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y_n^+ when n is even. The $n=2$ case needs to be treated separately from the $n>2$ cases.

Theorem 3.14 ([M, Proposition 5.3])**.** *The Y_2^+-module $L((\mu_1(u)))$ is finite dimensional if and only if there exists $\gamma(u)\in 1+u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ such that*

$$(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\gamma(u)\mu_1(u)=(1-a_1u^{-1})(1-a_2u^{-1})\dots(1-a_{2k+1}u^{-1})$$

where $a_{2i-1}+a_{2i}\geq 0$ for $i=1,\dots,k$.

We need a slight generalization of this theorem.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\mu_1(u)\in 1+u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. If the Y_2^+-module $L((\mu_1(u)))$ is finite dimensional and $\gamma(u)\in 1+u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ is such that $(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\gamma(u)\mu_1(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$ then we can write*

$$(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\gamma(u)\mu_1(u)=(1-a_1u^{-1})(1-a_2u^{-1})\dots(1-a_{2k+1}u^{-1}),$$

where $a_{2i-1}+a_{2i}\geq 0$ for $i=1,\dots,k$

Proof. Suppose that such a $\gamma(u)$ exists. By [M, Theorem 5.4] $L((\mu_1(u)))$ is finite dimensional if and only if there exists a monic polynomial $P(u)\in\mathbb{C}[u]$ with $P(u)=P(-u+1)$ and $c\in\mathbb{C}$ such that $P(-c)\neq 0$ and

$$\frac{\mu_1(-u)}{\mu_1(u)}=\frac{P(u+1)(u+c)(2u+1)}{P(u)(u-c)(2u-1)}.$$

Let $\lambda(u)=\mu_1(u)(1+cu^{-1})(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})$. Thus we have that $\lambda(-u)\Rightarrow\lambda(u)$, and since $\gamma(u)\lambda(u)=(1-a_1u^{-1})(1-a_2u^{-1})\dots(1-a_{2k+1}u^{-1})(1+cu^{-1})$, by Lemma 3.12 after re-indexing we have that $a_{2i-1}+a_{2i}\geq 0$ for $i=1,\dots,k$. □

Next we will give the classification of finite dimensional irreducible Y_n^+-modules for n even, $n > 2$. This depends on a certain Y_n^+ automorphism ψ:

$$\psi : Y_n^+ \to Y_n^+, \quad S_{i,j}(u) \mapsto S_{i',j'}(u), \tag{3.3}$$

where $i' = i$ if $i \neq \pm 1$, and $i' = -i$ if $i = \pm 1$.

If L is a Y_n^+-module, we let $L^\sharp$ denote the module created by twisting with ψ, that is, if $v \in L$, $y \in Y_n^+$, then $L^\sharp$ is the module created by the action $y.v = \psi(y)v$, where $\psi(y)v$ denotes the action given by L. Of course, if $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is a finite dimensional Y-module, then so is $L(\bar{\mu}(u))^\sharp$, and by Theorem 3.8 $L(\bar{\mu}(u))^\sharp$ is another highest weight module. To determine which highest weight module, we need to define the notation of a $\sharp'$-*special* element of a list of complex numbers. A list $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ of complex numbers can be indexed so that the following condition is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{for every } i = 1, \dots, k \text{ we have:}\\ &\text{if the set } \{a_p + a_q \mid 2i-1 \leq p < q \leq 2k+1\} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ is non-empty}\\ &\text{then } a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \text{ is its minimal element.}\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

For an element a in a list $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ of complex numbers, we say that a is a $\sharp'$-*special* element of $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ if $a = a_{2k+1}$ when $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ is indexed so that (3.4) holds.

Recall the definition of the a $\sharp$-special element of a list of complex numbers from the introduction. The following lemma shows that the concepts of the $\sharp$-special and $\sharp'$-special elements of a list are nearly identical.

Lemma 3.16. *Let $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ be a list of complex numbers. If the $\sharp$-special element of the list $(a_1 + 1/2, \dots, a_{2k+1} + 1/2)$ is defined then $a_{2k+1} + 1/2$ is the $\sharp$-special element of this list if and only if a_{2k+1} is the $\sharp'$-special element of the list $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$. In particular, the $\sharp'$-special element is unique in these circumstances.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k, the case $k = 0$ being clear. Let $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ be a list for which $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and for which (3.4) holds. Let $(b_1, \dots, b_{2k+1})$ be a re-indexing of $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ such that $b_{2i-1} + b_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Assume that $b_{2k+1} \neq a_{2k+1}$. Then after re-indexing we may assume that $b_1 = a_{2k+1}$. Let i be such that $a_i = b_2$. We assume that i is odd, as the case that i is even is proved similarly. Since $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ satisfies (3.4), we have that $a_i + a_{i+1} \leq a_i + a_{2k+1}$, so $a_{i+1} \leq a_{2k+1}$. If $k = 1$ then we must have that $a_{i+1} = b_3$, so the lemma holds in this case. If $k > 1$ then after re-indexing we may assume that $a_{i+1} = b_3$, so $a_{2k+1} + b_4 \geq 0$. Now we have that the lists $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+2}, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ and $(a_{2k+1}, b_4, \dots, b_{2k+1})$ also satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, so by induction $b_{2k+1} \leq a_{2k+1}$. □

Suppose $\mu(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ is such that there exists $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ such that $(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1 u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k+1}u^{-1})$, where $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ satisfies (3.4). If these conditions are met then we say that *$\mu^\sharp(u)$ is well-defined.* Now we define

$$\mu^\sharp(u) = \gamma(u)^{-1}(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})(1 - a_1 u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})(1 + (1 + a_{2k+1})u^{-1}) \tag{3.5}$$

Lemma 3.17. *The definition of $\mu^\sharp(u)$ is well-defined, that is, it does not depend on $\gamma(u)$.*

Proof. First we make the following observation. If $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ satisfies (3.4) and $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ then for any $a \in \mathbb{C}$ the list $(a, -a, a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ also satisfies (3.4). Note this also implies that if a and $-a$ both occur in $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ then the $\sharp'$-special element of the list $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ with one occurrence of a and $-a$ removed is also a_{2k+1}.

Now suppose that for $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ that $(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\gamma(u)\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k+1}u^{-1})$, where $a_{2i-i} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ satisfies (3.4). Also suppose for some $\gamma'(u) \in 1+u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ that $(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\gamma'(u)\mu(u) = (1-b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1-b_{2k'+1}u^{-1})$, where $b_{2i-i}+b_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k'$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_{2k'+1})$ satisfies (3.4).

By re-indexing we may write

$$(1-a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1-a_{2k+1}u^{-1}) = (1-a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1-a_pu^{-1})(1-a_{p+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1-a_q^2u^{-2})$$

and

$$(1-b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1-b_{2k'+1}u^{-1}) = (1-b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1-b_{p'}u^{-1})(1-b_{p'+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1-b_{q'}^2u^{-2}),$$

where $a_i \neq a_j$ for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $b_i \neq b_j$ for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, p'\}$. So

$$\frac{(1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_pu^{-1})(1 - a_{p+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1 - a_q^2u^{-2})}{(1 - b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - b_{p'}u^{-1})(1 - b_{p'+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1 - b_{q'}^2u^{-2})} = \frac{\gamma(u)}{\gamma'(u)},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}(1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_pu^{-1})&(1 + b_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 + b_{p'}u^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{\gamma(u)(1 - b_1^2u^{-2}) \dots (1 - b_{q'}^2u^{-2})}{\gamma'(u)(1 - a_{p+1}^2u^{-2}) \dots (1 - a_q^2u^{-2})} \in \mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]].\end{aligned}$$

Thus $p = p'$, and after re-indexing, $a_i = b_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Now the lemma follows from the above observation. □

The following theorem is contained in the proof of [M, Theorem 5.9].

Theorem 3.18. *Let* $\mu_1(u), \mu_3(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$ *where* $\mu_1^\sharp(u)$ *is well-defined. Then* $L((\mu_1(u), \mu_3(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u)))^\sharp = L((\mu_1^\sharp(u), \mu_3(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u)))$.

We will also need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.19. *If* $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ *satisfies* $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, k$ *and* a_{2k+1} *is the* $\sharp'$*-special element of* $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1})$ *then* $-1 - a_{2k+1}$ *is the* $\sharp'$*-special element of* $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k}, -1 - a_{2k+1})$.

Proof. Theorem 3.14 and Lemma 3.15 imply that the Y_2^+-module $L((\mu_1(u)))$, where $\mu_1(u) = (1-a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1-a_{2k+1}u^{-1})(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1})$, is finite dimensional, and by (3.5) and Theorem 3.18

$$L((\mu_1(u)))^\sharp = L(((1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k}u^{-1})(1 + (1 + a_{2k+1})u^{-1})(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1})).$$

Since ψ from (3.3) is an involution, we must have that

$$(L((\mu_1(u)))^\sharp)^\sharp = L(((1 - a_1u^{-1}) \dots (1 - a_{2k+1}u^{-1})(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1})).$$

Now suppose $\sharp'$-special element of $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k}, -1-a_{2k+1})$ is a_j for some $j \in \{1, \dots, 2k\}$. So by Theorem 3.18 $(a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1}) = (a_1, \dots, a_{j-1}, -1-a_j, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_{2k}, -1-a_{2k+1})$, so we must have that $(a_j, a_{2k+1}) = (-1-a_j, -1-a_{2k+1})$. Since $a_j \neq -1-a_{2k+1}$, we must have that $a_{2k+1} = -1-a_{2k+1}$, which implies that $a_{2k+1} = -\frac{1}{2} = -1-a_{2k+1}$, so by Lemma 3.16 the $\sharp'$-special element of $(a_1, \ldots, a_{2k}, -1-a_{2k+1})$ is in fact $-1-a_{2k+1}$. □

Here is the classification of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y_n^+ for even $n > 2$.

Theorem 3.20 ([M, Theorem 5.9])**.** *Let $n > 2$ be even. Then the Y_n^+-module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is finite dimensional if and only if $\mu_1^\sharp(u)$ is well defined and any of the following four conditions holds:*

(i) $\mu_1(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1(u) \to \mu_3(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$,
(ii) $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu_1(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1(u) \to \mu_3(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$,
(iii) $\mu_1^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1^\sharp(u) \to \mu_3(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$,
(iv) $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu_1^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1^\sharp(u) \to \mu_3(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$.

In order to give a more combinatorial description of this classification we need the following four lemmas. In each of the lemmas we assume for some $\gamma(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$ that

$$\mu(u) = \gamma(u)^{-1}(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}(1 - a_1u^{-1}) \ldots (1 - a_{2k+1}u^{-1})$$

where a_{2k+1} is the $\sharp'$-special element of $(a_1, \ldots, a_{2k+1})$ and $a_{2i-1} + a_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Lemma 3.21. *Let $\mu(u)$ be as above. Then $\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$ if and only if $a_{2k+1} \geq -\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$. Since $(1 - \frac{1}{4}u^{-2})\gamma(u)\mu(u) \in \mathbb{C}[u^{-1}]$, by Lemma 3.12 the list $(a_1, \ldots, a_{2k+1}, \frac{1}{2})$ can be re-indexed as $(b_1, \ldots, b_{2k+2})$ where $b_{2i-1} + b_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$. So $b_j = \frac{1}{2}$ for some j. We assume that j is odd, the proof when j is even is similar. By Lemma 3.16 $b_{j+1} \leq a_{2k+1}$, so $0 \leq b_{j+1} + \frac{1}{2} \leq a_{2k+1} + \frac{1}{2}$.

To prove the converse note that

$$\gamma(u)(1 - \frac{1}{4}u^{-2})\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1}) \ldots (1 - a_{2k+1}u^{-1})(1 - \frac{1}{2}u^{-1}),$$

then apply Lemma 3.10.

□

Lemma 3.22. *Let $\mu(u)$ be as above. Then $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$ if and only if $a_{2k+1} \geq 0$.*

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u) \text{ if and only if } (1 - \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu(-u) \Rightarrow (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu(u). \tag{3.6}$$

Suppose $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu(-u) \Rightarrow \mu(u)$. So by Lemma 3.12 and (3.6), the set $(a_1, \ldots, a_{2k+1}, 0)$ can be re-indexed as $(b_1, \ldots, b_{2k+2})$ where $b_{2i-1} + b_{2i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$. So $b_j = 0$ for some j. We assume that j is odd, the proof when j is even is similar. By Lemma 3.16 $b_{j+1} \leq a_{2k+1}$, so $0 \leq b_{j+1} \leq a_{2k+1}$.

The converse follows immediately from Lemma 3.10 and (3.6) since

$$\gamma(u)(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu(u) = (1 - a_1u^{-1}) \ldots (1 - a_{2k+1}u^{-1})(1 - 0u^{-1}).$$

□

Lemma 3.23. *Let $\mu(u)$ be as above. Then $\mu^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow \mu^\sharp(u)$ if and only if $a_{2k+1} \leq -\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. This follows from (3.5), Lemma 3.19, and Lemma 3.21. $\square$

Lemma 3.24. *Let $\mu(u)$ be as above. Then $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow \mu^\sharp(u)$ if and only if $a_{2k+1} \leq -1$.*

Proof. This follows from (3.5), Lemma 3.19, and Lemma 3.22. $\square$

Next we give the classification of the finite dimensional irreducible Y_n^+-modules for n odd. Note that for a highest weight representation of highest weight $\bar{\mu}(u) \in (1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{(n+1)/2}$, by the relation (2.16), we must have that $\mu_0(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$.

Theorem 3.25 ([M, Theorem 6.7])**.** *Assume that $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is odd. Then the Y_n^+-module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is finite dimensional if and only if either one of the the following two conditions holds:*

(i) $\mu_0(u) \to \mu_2(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$,
(ii) $\frac{2u}{2u+1}\mu_0(u) \to \mu_2(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$.

4. Proof of the classification theorem

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 on a case by case basis. First we recall from the introduction that we associate $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in I_n, j\in I_l} \in \mathrm{Tab}_{n,l}$ to an irreducible highest weight Y-module $L(A)$ with highest weight vector v by declaring that

$$(u - \frac{i}{2})^l S_{i,i}(u - \frac{i}{2})v = (u + a_{i,1-l})(u + a_{i,3-l}) \dots (u + a_{i,l-1})v$$

if l is even and $i \geq 0$, or

$$\begin{aligned}(u - \frac{i}{2})^{l-1}(u + \frac{\phi - i}{2})S_{i,i}(u - \frac{i}{2})v \\ = (u + a_{i,1-l})(u + a_{i,3-l}) \dots (u + a_{i,-2})(u + a_{i,0} + \delta_{i,0}/2)(u + a_{i,2}) \dots (u + a_{i,l-1})v\end{aligned}$$

if l is odd and $i \geq 0$. In other words, this means if

$$L(A) = L(\bar{\mu}(u)) \tag{4.1}$$

and l is even then

$$\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})$$

where $c_{i,j} = a_{i,j} + \frac{i}{2}$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_n \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. If l is odd then this means that

$$\mu_i(u) = (1 + \frac{\phi}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}(1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})$$

where $c_{i,j} = a_{i,j} + \frac{i+\delta_{i,0}\delta_{j,0}}{2}$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_n \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, j \in \mathcal{I}_l$.

Lemma 4.1. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that $\phi = -, \epsilon = +$, n is even, and l is even.*

Proof. In this case, by (1.1), an irreducible highest weight Y_n^--module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ factors through κ_l if $\mu_i(u)$ is a polynomial of degree l or less for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$. Furthermore, if $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is finite dimensional then by Theorem 3.9, Lemma 3.5, and Lemma 3.12 we can write $\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})$ for $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$ and $c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n-3\}$. Now associate to this data the skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n, j\in\mathcal{I}_j}$ indicated by (4.1), that is $a_{i,j} = c_{i,j} - \frac{i}{2}$ for $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$,

$j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $a_{i,j} = -a_{-i,-j}$ for $i \in \{1-n, 3-n, \ldots, -1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now it is clear that $A \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$.

It is also easy to see that given a skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_j} \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$, that $L(A) = L(\bar{\mu}(u))$, where $\bar{\mu}(u)$ is given by (4.1), is finite dimensional by Theorem 3.9, Lemma 3.4, and Lemma 3.10. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that* $\phi = -, \epsilon = -$, *n is even, and l is odd.*

Proof. In this case, by (1.1), an irreducible highest weight Y_n^--module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ factors through κ_l if $(1-\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_i(u)$ is a polynomial of degree at most l for all $i \in \{1, 3, \ldots, n-1\}$. If $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is finite dimensional then by Theorem 3.9, Lemma 3.5, and Lemma 3.12 for $i \in \{1, 3, \ldots, n-1\}$ we can write

$$(1 - \frac{1}{4}u^{-2})\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \ldots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})$$

such that $c_{1,0} \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$ and $c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j}$ for $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-3\}$. Now associate to this data the skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_j}$ indicated by (4.1), that is $a_{i,j} = c_{i,j} - \frac{i}{2}$ for $i \in \{1, 3, \ldots, n-1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $a_{i,j} = -a_{-i,-j}$ for $i \in \{1-n, 3-n, \ldots, -1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now it is clear that $A \in \mathrm{Col}^-_{n,l}$.

It is also easy to see that given a skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_j} \in \mathrm{Col}^-_{n,l}$, that $L(A) = L(\bar{\mu}(u))$, where $\bar{\mu}(u)$ is given by (4.1), is finite dimensional by Theorem 3.9, Lemma 3.4, and Lemma 3.10. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that* $\phi = +, \epsilon = +$, *$n = 2$, and l is odd.*

Proof. By (1.1), an irreducible highest weight Y_2^+-module $L((\mu_1(u)))$ factors through κ_l if $(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_1(u)$ is a polynomial of degree l or less. Now if $L((\mu_1(u)))$ is finite dimensional then by Theorem 3.14 and Lemma 3.15 $(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_1(u) = (1+c_{1-l}u^{-1})(1+c_{3-l}u^{-1}) \ldots (1 + c_{l-1}u^{-1})$ where $c_j + c_{-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now associate to this data the skew-symmetric $2 \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2, j \in \mathcal{I}_j}$ indicated by (4.1), that is $a_{1,j} = c_{1,j} - \frac{1}{2}$ for $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $a_{-1,j} = -a_{1,-j}$ for $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now it is clear that $A \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{2,l}$.

It is also easy to see that given a skew-symmetric $2 \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2, j \in \mathcal{I}_j} \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{2,l}$, that $L(A) = L((\mu_1(u)))$ where $\mu_1(u)$ is given by by (4.1) is a finite dimensional Y_n^--module by Theorem 3.14. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that* $\phi = +, \epsilon = +$, *$n > 2$ is even, and l is odd.*

Proof. By (1.1) the irreducible highest weight Y_n^+-module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ factors through κ_l if $\mu_i(u)(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})$ is a polynomial of degree l or less for all $i \in \{1, 3, \ldots, n-1\}$. So we can write $\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \ldots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 3, \ldots, n-1\}$.

If $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is finite dimensional then we need to examine the implications from the four conditions in Theorem 3.20 separately.

If condition (i) or condition (ii) holds from Theorem 3.20 then by Lemma 3.5 we can re-index each row of the matrix $(c_{i,j})_{i \in \{1,3,\ldots,n-1\}, j \in \mathcal{I}_l}$ so that

$$-c_{1,0} \quad \text{is the } \sharp'\text{-special element of} \quad (-c_{1,1-l}, -c_{1,3-l}, \ldots, -c_{1,l-1}) \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j} \quad \text{for} \quad j \in \mathcal{I}_l, i \in \{1, \dots, n-3\}. \tag{4.3}$$

If condition (i) from Theorem 3.20 holds then since

$$(1 - \frac{1}{4}u^{-2})\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1 - \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})$$

for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$, we have by Lemmas 3.12 and 3.21 that can further re-index so that (4.2) and (4.3) still hold, $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $c_{1,0} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $c_{3,0} \leq c_{1,0}$ we now have that $c_{1,0} + c_{3,0} \leq 1$

If condition (ii) holds from Theorem 3.20 then since $(1 - \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_1(-u) \Rightarrow (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_1(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})$, by Lemmas 3.12 and 3.22 we can further re-index so that (4.2) and (4.3) still hold, $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $c_{1,0} \leq 0$. Since $c_{3,0} \leq c_{1,0}$ we now have that $c_{1,0} + c_{3,0} \leq 0$.

If condition (iii) or condition (iv) holds from Theorem 3.20 then by Lemma 3.5 and (3.5) we can re-index each row of the matrix $(c_{i,j})_{i \in \{1,3,\dots,n-1\}, j \in \mathcal{I}_l}$ so that

$$-c_{1,0} \quad \text{is the } \sharp'\text{-special element of} \quad (-c_{1,1-l}, -c_{1,3-l}, \dots, -c_{1,l-1}), \tag{4.4}$$

$$c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l, i \in \{1, \dots, n-3\}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$c_{i,0} \geq c_{i+2,0} \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{3, \dots, n-3\}, \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$c_{1,0} + c_{3,0} \leq 1 \tag{4.7}$$

(here (4.7) holds since $\mu_1(u)^\sharp \to \mu_3(u)$).

If condition (iii) holds from Theorem 3.20 then since $(1 - \frac{1}{4}u^{-1})\mu_1^\sharp(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + (1 - c_{1,0})u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1 - \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})$, by Lemmas 3.12 and 3.23 we can further re-index so that (4.4), (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7) still hold, $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $c_{1,0} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $-c_{3,0} \geq c_{1,0} - 1$ we now have that $c_{1,0} - c_{3,0} \geq c_{1,0} + c_{1,0} - 1 \geq 0$.

If condition (iv) holds from Theorem 3.20 then since $(1 - \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_1^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_1^\sharp(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + (1 - c_{1,0})u^{-1})) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})$, by Lemmas 3.12 and 3.24 we can further re-index so that (4.4), (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7) still hold, $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $c_{1,0} \geq 1$. Since $-c_{3,0} \geq c_{1,0} - 1$ we now have that $c_{1,0} - c_{3,0} \geq c_{1,0} + c_{1,0} - 1 \geq 1$.

Now associate to this data the skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_j}$ indicated by (4.1), that is $a_{i,j} = c_{i,j} - \frac{i}{2}$ for $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and $a_{i,j} = -a_{-i,-j}$ for $i \in \{1-n, 3-n, \dots, -1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, and now it is clear that $A \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$.

Now suppose that we are given $A = (a_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n, j \in \mathcal{I}_j} \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$. Associate to A the tuple $\bar{\mu}(u) \in (1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{n/2}$ as indicated by (4.1), where $\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,3-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$. So we have that $c_{1,j} + c_{1,-j} \leq 0$ for $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, $c_{1,0} + c_{3,0} \leq 1$, and $c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j}$ for $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-3\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now it is clear by Lemma 3.4 that $\mu_1(u) \to \mu_3(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$. Since $c_{1,0} + c_{3,0} \leq 1$ and $c_{1,0} - c_{3,0} \geq 0$, we have that $2c_{1,0} \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $c_{1,0} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ then by Lemma 3.21 $\mu_1(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1(u)$. If $c_{1,0} \leq 0$ then by Lemma 3.22 $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu_1(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1(u)$. If $c_{1,0} > \frac{1}{2}$ then by Lemma 3.23 $\mu_1^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1^\sharp(u)$. If $c_{1,0} > 0$ then by Lemma 3.24 $\frac{2u-1}{2u+1}\mu_1^\sharp(-u) \Rightarrow \mu_1^\sharp(u)$. So in order to apply Theorem 3.20 to prove that $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is finite dimensional, we need to establish that $\mu_1^\sharp(u) \to \mu_3(u)$ in the cases that $c_{1,0} > \frac{1}{2}$

and $c_{1,0} > 0$. By (3.5) the only thing we still need to establish is that $c_{1,k} + c_{3,k} \leq 1$ where $-c_{1,k}$ is the $\sharp'$-special element of $(-c_{1,1-l}, -c_{3-l}, \dots, -c_{l-1})$. If $k = 0$ then we are done, so assume $k \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.16 we have that $c_{1,k} \leq c_{1,0}$. If $c_{3,k} \leq c_{3,0}$, then $c_{1,k} + c_{3,k} \leq c_{1,0} + c_{3,0} \leq 1$, hence the lemma is proved. If $c_{3,k} > c_{3,0}$ then we can re-index the rows of $(c_{i,j})_{i\in\{1,3,\dots,n-1\},j\in\mathcal{I}_l}$ by interchanging $c_{i,k}$ with $c_{i,0}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$, $i > 1$. Now we have that $c_{1,k}+c_{3,k} \leq 1$, so $\mu_1^\sharp(u) \to \mu_3(u)$, so $L(A)$ is finite dimensional by Theorem 3.20. □

Lemma 4.5. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that* $\phi = +, \epsilon = -$, *n is even, and l is even.*

Proof. Let e' be a nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}^+_{n(l+1)}$ so that the Jordan type of e' is $((l+1)^n)$. By Corollary 2.2 every $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module is a $U(\mathfrak{g}^+_{n(l+1)}, e')$-module, so we need only determine which finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}^+_{n(l+1)}, e')$-modules factor through ζ. By (1.1) the finite dimensional $U(\mathfrak{g}^+_{n(l+1)}, e')$-module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ where $\mu_i(u) = (1 + c_{i,-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,2-l}u^{-1})\dots(1 + c_{i,l}u^{-1})(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}$ factors through ζ precisely when $\mu_i(u)$ is a polynomial of degree l or less for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$. This implies that for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ there exists $k \in \mathcal{I}_{l+1}$ such that $c_{i,k} = 1/2$. Now if A^+ is the skew symmetric $n \times (l+1)$ tableaux associated to this data as in (4.1), then we can permute entries within rows so that A^+ has middle column

$$\frac{n}{2} - 1, \frac{n}{2} - 2, \dots, 1, 0, 0, -1, -2, \dots, 1 - \frac{n}{2},$$

which implies the lemma. □

Lemma 4.6. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that* $\phi = +, \epsilon = +$, *n is odd, and l is odd.*

Proof. By (1.1) we have that an irreducible highest weight Y_n^+-module $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ factors through κ_l if $\mu_i(u)(1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})$ is a polynomial of degree l or less for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$. So for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ we can write $\mu_i(u) = (1+c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1+c_{i,3-l}u^{-1})\dots(1+c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 3, \dots, n-1\}$. Additionally, since $\mu_0(u) \in 1 + u^{-2}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-2}]]$, we must have that $\mu_0(u)$ is a polynomial of degree $l - 1$ or less, and we can re-index so that

$$c_{0,j} = -c_{0,-j} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l \quad \text{and} \quad c_{0,0} = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.8}$$

If condition (i) holds from Theorem 3.25 then by Lemma 3.5 we can re-index so that (4.8) holds and $c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j}$ for $i \in \{0, 2, \dots, n-3\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. In particular, we now have that $\frac{1}{2} \geq c_{2,0} \geq c_{4,0} \geq \dots \geq c_{n-1,0}$. Associate to this data the skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n,j\in\mathcal{I}_j}$ where $a_{0,0} = 0$, $a_{i,j} = c_{i,j} - \frac{i}{2}$ for $i \in \{0, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, $(i,j) \neq (0,0)$, and $a_{i,j} = -a_{-i,-j}$ for $i \in \{1-n, 3-n, \dots, -1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now it is clear that $A \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$.

If condition (ii) holds from Theorem 3.25 then $\mu_0(u) \to (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_2(u) \to (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_4(u) \to \dots \to (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})\mu_{n-1}(u)$. So by Lemma 3.5 we can re-index so that (4.8) holds, $0 \geq c_{2,0} \geq c_{4,0} \geq \dots \geq c_{n-1,0}$, and $c_{i,j} \geq c_{i+2,j}$ for $i \in \{0, 2, \dots, n-3\}$, $0 \neq j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Associate to this data the skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n,j\in\mathcal{I}_j}$ where $a_{0,0} = 0$, $a_{i,j} = c_{i,j} - \frac{i}{2}$ for $i \in \{0, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$, $(i,j) \neq (0,0)$, and $a_{i,j} = -a_{-i,-j}$ for $i \in \{1-n, 3-n, \dots, -1\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_l$. Now it is clear that $A \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$.

Now suppose we are given $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n, j\in\mathcal{I}_j} \in \mathrm{Col}^+_{n,l}$. Associate to A the tuple $\bar{\mu}(u) \in (1+u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]])^{(n+1)/2}$ as indicated by (4.1), where $\mu_i(u) = (1+c_{i,1-l}u^{-1})(1+c_{i,3-l}u^{-1})\dots(1+c_{i,l-1}u^{-1})(1+\frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{0, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. Now if $c_{2,0} \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}\backslash\mathbb{Z}$ then by Lemma 3.4 $\mu_0(u) \to \mu_2(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$, and if $c_{2,0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ then by Lemma 3.4 $\frac{2u}{2u+1}\mu_0(u) \to \mu_2(u) \to \mu_4(u) \to \cdots \to \mu_{n-1}(u)$, so $L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ is a finite dimensional Y_n^--module by Theorem 3.25. ☐

Lemma 4.7. *Theorem 1.2 holds in the case that $\phi = +, \epsilon = -$, n is odd, and l is even.*

Proof. Mimic the proof of Lemma 4.5. ☐

5. BGK HIGHEST WEIGHT THEORY FOR RECTANGULAR FINITE W-ALGEBRAS

In this section we show that certain irreducible highest weight $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules as defined in [BGK] are isomorphic to the $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules $L(A)$ for $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$, provided one makes the right choices in defining the irreducible highest weight $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules from [BGK]. Throughout this section, unless otherwise indicated, $\mathfrak{g}$ denotes an arbitrary reductive Lie algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, and $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ is a nilpotent element for which the grading from (2.1) is even, though all the results we mention hold in general. Refer to [BGK] for the general results.

5.1. **Highest weight theory for $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.** In [BGK] Brundan, Goodwin, and Kleshchev define the notion of a highest weight $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module. The key to this is a reductive subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ which contains e. This leads to the "smaller" finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ which plays the role of a Cartan subalgebra in defining highest weight modules.

To define $\mathfrak{g}_0$, first choose $\mathfrak{t}$, a maximal toral subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, so that it contains h and so that $\mathfrak{t}^e$ is a maximal toral subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^e \cap \mathfrak{g}(0)$. For $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$ let $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ denote the α-weight space of $\mathfrak{g}$. So

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Phi^e} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha,$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is the centralizer of $\mathfrak{t}^e$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\Phi^e \subset (\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$ denotes the set of nonzero weights of $\mathfrak{t}^e$ on $\mathfrak{g}$. Thus we have defined $\mathfrak{g}_0$, which is now a minimal Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing e.

Next we choose a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $\mathfrak{t}$, and let Φ^+ denote the corresponding set of positive roots. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{g}_0 + \mathfrak{b}$, which is a parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ with Levi factor $\mathfrak{g}_0$. For each simple root $\alpha \in \Phi^+$, the corresponding root space of $\mathfrak{g}$ must lie in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ or the nil-radical of $\mathfrak{q}$. It follows that $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ or $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ for each $\alpha \in \Phi^e$. Define $\Phi^e_+ = \{\alpha \in \Phi^e \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subseteq \mathfrak{q}\}$. This defines the *dominance order* $\geq$ on $(\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$: $\lambda \geq \mu$ if $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Phi^e_+$, and it is now the case that $\Phi^e = -\Phi^e_+ \sqcup \Phi^e_+$.

Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^e$, or $\mathfrak{p}$, and for $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$ let $\mathfrak{a}_\alpha$ denote the α-weight space of $\mathfrak{a}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}_\pm = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Phi^e_\pm} \mathfrak{a}_\alpha$, so $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_- \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_+$ and $U(\mathfrak{a}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}\Phi^e} U(\mathfrak{a})_\alpha$. In particular, $U(\mathfrak{a})_0$ is a subalgebra. Let $U(\mathfrak{a})_\sharp$ denote the *left* ideal of $U(\mathfrak{a})$ generated by the roots spaces $\mathfrak{a}_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Phi^e_+$. Similarly let $U(\mathfrak{a})_\flat$ denote the *right* ideal of $U(\mathfrak{a})$ generated by the roots spaces $\mathfrak{a}_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Phi^e_-$. Let $U(\mathfrak{a})_{0,\sharp} = U(\mathfrak{a})_0 \cap U(\mathfrak{a})_\sharp$, and $U(\mathfrak{a})_{\flat,0} = U(\mathfrak{a})_0 \cap U(\mathfrak{a})_\flat$. Now the PBW theorem implies that $U(\mathfrak{a})_{0,\sharp} = U(\mathfrak{a})_{\flat,0}$, hence $U(\mathfrak{a})_{0,\sharp}$ is a two-sided ideal of $U(\mathfrak{a})_0$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{a}_0$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{a}$, and we actually have that $U(\mathfrak{a})_0 = U(\mathfrak{a}_0) \oplus U(\mathfrak{a})_{0,\sharp}$. Let

$$\pi : U(\mathfrak{a})_0 \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{a}_0)$$

be the algebra homomorphism defined by projection along this decomposition.

It is easy to see that

$$\mathfrak{t}^e \subseteq U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \tag{5.1}$$

since $([m, t], e) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathfrak{m}, t \in \mathfrak{t}^e$. Recall that the good filtration on $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is defined in §2.2, and that $\operatorname{gr} U(\mathfrak{g}, e) = U(\mathfrak{g}^e)$. The following theorem is due to Premet in [P1]:

Theorem 5.1. *There exists a $\mathfrak{t}^e$-equivariant injection $\Theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \hookrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ such that $\operatorname{gr} \Theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \hookrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}^e)$ is the natural embedding.*

It should be noted that Θ is not a Lie algebra homomorphism.

Let $h_1, \dots, h_l$ be a basis of $\mathfrak{g}^e_0$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_m$, and $e_1, \dots, e_m$ be $\mathfrak{t}^e$-weight bases of $\mathfrak{g}^e_-$ and $\mathfrak{g}^e_+$ respectively, such that f_i is of weight $-\gamma_i$, and e_i is of weight γ_i for $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in \Phi^e_+$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, l$, let $F_i = \Theta(f_i), E_i = \Theta(e_i)$, and $H_j = \Theta(h_j)$. For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\geq \mathbf{0}}$, let $F^{\mathbf{a}} = F_1^{a_1} \dots F_m^{a_m}$. For $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{l}}_{\geq \mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\geq \mathbf{0}}$ define $H^{\mathbf{b}}, E^{\mathbf{c}}$ similarly. Theorem 5.1 implies that the following is a PBW basis of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$:

$$\{F^{\mathbf{a}} H^{\mathbf{b}} E^{\mathbf{c}} \mid \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\geq \mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{l}}_{\geq \mathbf{0}}\}.$$

Let $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\sharp$ be the *left* ideal of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ generated by $\{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$. Let $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\flat$ be the *right* ideal of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ generated by $\{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$. Let $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{0,\sharp} = U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\sharp \cap U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$. Let $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\flat,0} = U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\flat \cap U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$. Now from the above PBW basis it is clear that $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{0,\sharp} = U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\flat,0}$, and so $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{0,\sharp}$ is a *two-sided* ideal of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$.

Let $b_1, \dots, b_r$ be a homogeneous basis for $\mathfrak{m}$ such that b_i is of degree $-d_i$ and $\mathfrak{t}$-weight $\beta_i \in \mathfrak{t}^*$, and let

$$\gamma = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ \beta_i|_{\mathfrak{t}^e} \in \Phi^e_-}} \beta_i. \tag{5.2}$$

By [BGK, Lemma 4.1], γ extends uniquely to a character of $\mathfrak{p}_0$. Let $S_{-\gamma} : U(\mathfrak{p}_0) \to U(\mathfrak{p}_0)$ be defined by $S_{-\gamma}(x) = x - \gamma(x)$ for $x \in \mathfrak{p}_0$, so $S_{-\gamma}$ an algebra isomorphism.

Theorem 5.2 ([BGK, Theorem 4.3])**.** *The restriction of $S_{-\gamma} \circ \pi : U(\mathfrak{p})_0 \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{p}_0)$ to $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$ defines a surjective algebra homomorphism*

$$\pi_{-\gamma} : U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$$

with $\ker \pi_{-\gamma} = U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{0,\sharp}$.

For a $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module V and $\lambda \in (\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$ let

$$V_\lambda = \{v \in V \mid (t + \gamma(t))v = \lambda(t) \text{ for all } t \in \mathfrak{t}^e\}, \tag{5.3}$$

recalling that $\mathfrak{t}^e$ is naturally a subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ by (5.1). Now it is the case that $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\alpha V_\lambda \subseteq V_{\lambda+\alpha}$, so V_λ is preserved by $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$. We say that V_λ is a *maximal weight space of* V if $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\sharp V_\lambda = 0$. Assuming this is the case, the action of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$ factors through the homomorphism $\pi_{-\gamma}$ from Theorem 5.2, thus V_λ is also a $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$-module. Since $\mathfrak{t}^e$ can naturally be considered a subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ by (5.1) again, restricting the action of $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ on V_λ to $\mathfrak{t}^e$ gives a new action of $\mathfrak{t}^e$ on V_λ satisfying

$$t.v = \lambda(t)v \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathfrak{t}^e$$

(which is why the shift by γ is included in the definition of the λ-weight space of a $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module from (5.3)).

A $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$-module is a *highest weight module* if it is generated by a maximal weight space V_λ such that V_λ is finite dimensional and irreducible as a $U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)$-module. Let

$$\{V_\Lambda \mid \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}\}$$

be a complete set of isomorphism classes of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)$-modules for some indexing set $\mathcal{L}$. Since $U(\mathfrak{g},e)_\sharp$ is invariant under left multiplication by $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ and right multiplication by $U(\mathfrak{g},e)_0$, we have that $U(\mathfrak{g},e)/U(\mathfrak{g},e)_\sharp$ is a $(U(\mathfrak{g},e),U(\mathfrak{g},e)_0)$-bimodule. Moreover the right action of $U(\mathfrak{g},e)_0$ factors through the homomorphism $\pi_{-\gamma}$ from Theorem 5.2. Thus we have that $U(\mathfrak{g},e)/U(\mathfrak{g},e)_\sharp$ is a $(U(\mathfrak{g},e),U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e))$-bimodule. For $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, define $M(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q})$, the *Verma module of type* Λ via

$$M(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q}) = U(\mathfrak{g},e)/U(\mathfrak{g},e)_\sharp \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)} V_\Lambda.$$

By [BGK, Theorem 4.5] $M(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q})$ has a unique maximal proper submodule $R(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q})$. Let $L(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q}) = M(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q})/R(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q})$. Now also by [BGK, Theorem 4.5] we have that $\{L(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q}) \mid \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}\}$ is a complete set of isomorphism classes of irreducible highest weight modules for $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}^+ = \{\Lambda \in \mathcal{L} \mid \dim L(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q}) < \infty\}.$$

By [BGK, Corollary 4.6], $\{L(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q}) \mid \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^+\}$ is a complete set of isomorphism classes of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$-modules.

Unfortunately, an explicit set $\mathcal{L}$ parameterizing the finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)$-modules is unknown in general. In the next subsection, we focus on a special case in which such a parameterization is available.

5.2. **The case that e is regular in $\mathfrak{g}_0$.** We assume in this section that e is a regular nilpotent element of $\mathfrak{g}_0$. In this case, Kostant showed in [K, §2] that $U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e) \cong Z(\mathfrak{g}_0)$. In turn, by the Harish-Chandra Isomorphism, $Z(\mathfrak{g}_0) \cong S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$ where W_0 is the Weyl group associated to $\mathfrak{g}_0$. We state this more precisely in the following lemma. Let

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\alpha\in\Phi \\ \alpha|_{\mathfrak{t}^e} \in \Phi^e_+}} \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{1\le i\le r \\ \beta_i|_{\mathfrak{t}^e}=0}} \beta_i,$$

where the β_i are defined as in (5.2). The following lemma is essentially [BGK, Lemma 5.1]:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\xi : U(\mathfrak{p}_0) \to S(\mathfrak{t})$ be the homomorphism induced by the natural projection $\mathfrak{p}_0 \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{t}$. Let $S_{-\eta} : S(\mathfrak{t}) \to S(\mathfrak{t}), x \mapsto x - \eta(x)$ for $x \in \mathfrak{t}$. Then the map $\xi_{-\eta} := S_{-\eta} \circ \xi$ defines an algebra isomorphism $U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$.*

Since $S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$ is a free polynomial algebra, we have by the isomorphism from Lemma 5.3 that $\mathcal{L} = \mathfrak{t}^*/W_0 = \text{m-Spec}(S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0})$. In this case we can describe the subset $\mathcal{L}^+$ of $\mathcal{L}$, corresponding to the finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)$-modules Λ for which $L(\Lambda,\mathfrak{q})$ is finite dimensional, in combinatorial terms. Recall that we have fixed a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $\mathfrak{t}$, and Φ^+ is the corresponding set of positive roots. Let $\Phi^+_0 = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_0\}$ denote the resulting system of positive roots for the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ let $L(\lambda)$ denote the irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g})$-module of highest weight $\lambda - \rho$, where $\rho = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\in\Phi^+} \alpha$.

Theorem 5.4 ([BGK, Conjecture 5.2], proved by Losev in [Lo3])**.** *For $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ pick $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $(\lambda, \alpha^\vee) \notin \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi_0^+$. Then $L(\Lambda, \mathfrak{q})$ is finite dimensional if and only if $\mathcal{VA}(\mathrm{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})} L(\lambda)) = \overline{G.e}$.*

Remark 5.5. In the course of this work we also understood how to apply the results of this chapter and the algorithms for calculating $\mathcal{VA}(\mathrm{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})} L(\lambda))$ from [BV] to independently verify that Theorem 5.4 holds in these cases. In fact it is possible to use Losev's proof of Conjecture 5.4 and (1.1) to recover Molev's classification of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of Y from the classification of the finite dimensional irreducible representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ obtained via BGK highest weight theory.

5.3. BGK highest weight theory for rectangular finite W-algebras.

In this subsection we show how to identify the irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module $L(A)$ for $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$ with a BGK highest weight module. For a rectangular finite W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ we have that e is regular in $\mathfrak{g}_0$, so Theorem 5.4 applies to these finite W-algebras.

First we need to fix choices of $\mathfrak{t}$, a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\mathfrak{b}$, a Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ as in §5.2. We let $\mathfrak{t}$ be the span of diagonal matrices in $\mathfrak{g}$. We choose our Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ by specifying a system of positive roots. For $a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ let $\epsilon_a \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ be the restriction to $\mathfrak{t}$ of the diagonal coordinate function of $\mathfrak{g}_{nl}$ given by $\epsilon_a(e_{b,b}) = \delta_{a,b}$. If $\epsilon = -$ (so nl is even) our positive root system is

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^+ = \{\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) < \mathrm{row}(b)\} \\ \cup \{\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) = \mathrm{row}(b), \mathrm{col}(a) < \mathrm{col}(b)\}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\epsilon = +$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^+ = \{\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) < \mathrm{row}(b), a \neq -b\} \\ \cup \{\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) = \mathrm{row}(b), \mathrm{col}(a) < \mathrm{col}(b), a \neq -b\}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to this choice of positive roots.

Next we give an explicit basis for $\mathfrak{t}^e$, the centralizer of e in $\mathfrak{t}$. In [B1, Lemma 3.2] a basis for $\mathfrak{g}^e$ is given in terms of certain elements $\{f_{i,j;r}\}$, where $f_{i,j;r}$ is nilpotent unless $r = 0$. So by [B1, Lemma 3.2] a basis for $\mathfrak{t}^e$ is given by

$$\{f_{i,i;0} \mid i \in \mathcal{I}_n \cap \mathbb{Z}_{<0}\}.$$

More explicitly, for $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ we have that

$$f_{i,i;0} = \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{row}(a) = i}} f_{a,a}.$$

Next we give basis for $(\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$. Let $\delta_i \in (\mathfrak{t}^e)^*$ be defined via $\delta_i(f_{j,j,;0}) = \delta_{i,j}$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$, $i, j < 0$, and for $i > 0$ let $\delta_i = -\delta_{-i}$.

Now $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is the span of $\{f_{a,b} \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) = \mathrm{row}(b)\}$, so

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}_l^{\oplus n/2} & \text{if } n \text{ is even;} \\ \mathfrak{g}_l^{\epsilon} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_l^{\oplus (n-1)/2} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

We also have that the parabolic $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{b} + \mathfrak{g}_0$ is the span of

$$\{f_{a,b} \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) \leq \mathrm{row}(b)\}.$$

Note that for $a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$, we have that $f_{a,b} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\delta_{\mathrm{row}(b)} - \delta_{\mathrm{row}(a)}}$. Thus

$$\Phi^e_+ = \{\delta_i - \delta_j \mid i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n, i < j\}.$$

Recall for $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ that there is a map $s_{i,j} : T(\mathfrak{g}_l) \to U(\mathfrak{g})$ defined in (2.23). This definition makes it clear that for any $v \in T(\mathfrak{g}_l)$, $s_{i,j}(v) \in U(\mathfrak{g})_{\delta_j - \delta_i}$. Thus we can explicitly state a choice for the $\mathfrak{t}^e$-equivariant map $\Theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \to U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ from (5.1): For $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$, $r \geq 0$ we set $\Theta(f_{i,j;r}) = s_{i,j}(\omega_{r+1})$. Thus $\{s_{i,j}(\omega_{r+1}) \mid r \geq 0, i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n, i < j\}$ generates the left $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ ideal $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\sharp$.

Recall the homomorphisms $\pi_{-\gamma} : U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ from Theorem 5.2 and $\xi_{-\eta} : U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$ from Lemma 5.3. These maps make every $S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$-module a $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$-module. We need to calculate the action of $s_{i,i}(\omega_{r+1})$ on a $S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$-module, so we need to calculate $\xi_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega_r))$. We do this with a series of lemmas.

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\tilde{\imath} = \widehat{-\imath}$. This lemma is a special case of [B1, Lemma 4.1]:

Lemma 5.6. *For $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n, p, q \in \mathcal{I}_l$*

$$\begin{aligned}
&[s_{i,j}(e_{p,q}), s_{h,k}(e_{v,w})] \\
&\quad = \delta_{h,j}\delta_{q,v} s_{i,k}(e_{p,w}) - \delta_{i,k}\delta_{p,w} s_{h,j}(e_{v,q}) \\
&\qquad + \iota(-\delta_{h,-i}\delta_{v,-p} s_{-j,k}(e_{-q,w}) + \delta_{-j,k}\delta_{w,-q} s_{h,-i}(e_{v,-p})),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\iota = \begin{cases} \phi^{\hat{\imath}\hat{p} + \tilde{\imath}\tilde{p} + \hat{\jmath}\hat{q} + \tilde{\jmath}\tilde{q}} \epsilon^{\hat{p}+\hat{q}} & \textit{if } p, q \neq 0; \\ \phi^{\hat{\jmath}\hat{q} + \tilde{\jmath}\tilde{q}} \epsilon^{\hat{\imath}+\hat{q}} & \textit{if } p = 0,\ q \neq 0; \\ \phi^{\hat{\imath}\hat{p} + \tilde{\imath}\tilde{p}} \epsilon^{\hat{p}+\hat{\jmath}} & \textit{if } p \neq 0,\ q = 0; \\ \epsilon^{\hat{\imath}+\hat{\jmath}} & \textit{if } p, q = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Note that $s_{i,i}(\omega_r)$ is a linear combination of monomials of the form

$$s_{i,i_1}(e_{p_1,q_1}) s_{i_1,i_2}(e_{p_2,q_2}) \dots s_{i_{m-1},i}(e_{p_m,q_m}), \tag{5.5}$$

where $i_j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$, $p_i \leq q_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $q_i < p_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$. So to calculate $\xi_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega_r))$ we first prove a lemma about applying $\pi : U(\mathfrak{p})_0 \to U(\mathfrak{p}_0)$ to such monomials.

Lemma 5.7. *Let*

$$v = s_{i,i_1}(e_{p_1,q_1}) s_{i_1,i_2}(e_{p_2,q_2}) \dots s_{i_{m-1},i}(e_{p_m,q_m})$$

be as in (5.5). *If $i \geq 0$ then $\pi(v) = 0$ unless $i_1 = i_2 = \cdots = i_{m-1} = i$.*

Proof. For uniformity, let $i_0, i_m = i$. The key fact used repeatedly in this proof is that if $w = s_{j_1,j_2}(e_{r_1,r_2}) \dots s_{j_k,j_{k+1}}(e_{r_k,r_{k+1}}) \in U(\mathfrak{p})_0$ satisfies $j_1 > j_2$ or $j_k < j_{k+1}$ then $w \in U(\mathfrak{p})_{0,\sharp} = U(\mathfrak{p})_{\flat,0}$, so $\pi(w) = 0$.

By Lemma 5.6 we see that each term $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ of v commutes with all terms $s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k})$ in v unless $p_k = q_j$, $q_k = p_j$, $p_k = -p_j$, or $q_k = -q_j$.

Suppose that there exists j such that $i_{j-1} < i_j$ and $p_j, q_j > 0$. Then $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ commutes with every term to its right, so $\pi(v) = 0$. Next suppose that there exists a j such that $i_{j-1} > i_j$ and $p_j, q_j < 0$. Then $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ commutes with every term to its left in v, so $\pi(v) = 0$. So $\pi(v) = 0$ unless v satisfies $i_{j-1} \leq i_j$ if $q_j \leq 0$ and $i_{j-1} \geq i_j$ if $p_j \geq 0$, so *for the rest of this proof we assume that this is the case.*

Now suppose that there exists a j such that $p_j < 0$, $q_j > 0$ and $i_{j-1} < i_j$. Then for all k we must have that $i_k \geq 0$. Note that $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ must commute with every term to its right unless there exists $k > j$ such that $p_k = -p_j$. In this case, $[s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j}), s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k})]$ is a multiple of $s_{-i_j,i_k}(e_{-q_j,q_k})$, which commutes with every term to the right of $s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k})$. Furthermore since $i_j > 0$ and $i_k \geq 0$ we have that $-i_j < i_k$. Thus $\pi(v) = 0$.

Next suppose that there exists a j such that $p_j < 0$, $q_j > 0$ and $i_{j-1} > i_j$. Then for all k we must have that $i_k \geq 0$. Note that $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ must commute with every term to its left unless there exists $k < j$ such that $q_k = -q_j$. In this case, $[s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k}), s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})]$ is a multiple of $s_{i_{j-1},-i_{k-1}}(e_{p_j,-p_k})$, which commutes with every term to the left of $s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k})$, and it also satisfies $i_{j-1} > -i_{k-1}$. Thus $\pi(v) = 0$.

So for the rest of the proof we will assume that if there exists a j such that $p_j < 0$ and $q_j > 0$ then $i_{j-1} = i_j$.

Let j be such that $i_{j-1} < i_j$ and i_j is maximal in $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$. Now it must be the case that $q_j < 0$. Since $i_k \geq 0$ for all k, by Lemma 5.6 $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ must commute with every term to its right unless $i = 0$. So if $i \neq 0$, then $\pi(v) = 0$, so assume that $i = 0$. Even in the case that $i = 0$, since $i_j > 0$ we still have that $s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j})$ commutes with every term to its right unless there exists a $k > j$ such that $p_k = -p_j$. In this case, $[s_{i_{j-1},i_j}(e_{p_j,q_j}), s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k})]$ is a multiple of $s_{-i_j,i_k}(e_{-q_j,q_k})$ which commutes with every term to the right of $s_{i_{k-1},i_k}(e_{p_k,q_k})$. Furthermore, $-i_j < i_k$ since $i_j > 0$, so $\pi(v) = 0$.

Thus we have proven that $\pi(v) \neq 0$ if and only if $i_0 = i_1 = i_2 = \cdots = i_m = i$. □

Observe that if

$$v = s_{i,i_1}(e_{p_1,q_1}) s_{i_1,i_2}(e_{p_2,q_2}) \dots s_{i_{m-1},i}(e_{p_m,q_m}) \in U(\mathfrak{p}_0)$$

then

$$\xi(v) = 0 \text{ unless } p_j = q_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m. \tag{5.6}$$

Lemma 5.8. *Let* $i \in \mathcal{I}_n \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, p \in \mathcal{I}_l$. *Then*

$$S_{-\eta}(S_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(e_{p,p} + \rho_p))) = \begin{cases} s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}) + \frac{i}{2} & \text{if } p \neq 0; \\ s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}) + \frac{i}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} & \text{if } p = 0,\ i \neq 0; \\ s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}) & \text{if } p, i = 0; \end{cases}$$

Proof. Recall that the weight γ is defined by choosing a weight basis $\{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$ for $\mathfrak{m}$, where each b_i is of weight $\beta_i \in \mathfrak{t}^*$. A natural basis to choose is

$$\{f_{a,b} \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, (a,b) \text{ is admissible, } \operatorname{col}(a) > \operatorname{col}(b)\},$$

where (a,b) is admissible if $a + b < 0$ if $\epsilon = 1$ and $a + b \leq 0$ if $\epsilon = -1$. Note that $f_{a,b}$ is of weight $\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b$. Recall that γ is now defined by

$$\gamma = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ \beta_i|_{\mathfrak{t}^e} \in \Phi^e_-}} \beta_i.$$

Thus in these cases

$$\gamma = \sum_{\substack{a,b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \operatorname{col}(a) > \operatorname{col}(b) \\ \operatorname{row}(a) > \operatorname{row}(b) \\ (a,b) \text{ is admissible}}} \epsilon_a - \epsilon_b. \tag{5.7}$$

So we have for $a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ that

$$\gamma(f_{a,a}) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{RA}(a)\mathrm{CL}(a) - \mathrm{RB}(a)\mathrm{CR}(a) - \epsilon & \text{if } a \text{ is in the lower right quadrant;} \\ \mathrm{RA}(a)\mathrm{CL}(a) - \mathrm{RB}(a)\mathrm{CR}(a) + \epsilon & \text{if } a \text{ is in the upper left quadrant;} \\ \mathrm{RA}(a)\mathrm{CL}(a) - \mathrm{RB}(a)\mathrm{CR}(a) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathrm{RA}(a)$ denotes the number of rows occurring strictly above the number a in the $n \times l$ array used to define $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ in §2.2, $\mathrm{RB}(a)$ denotes the number of rows strictly below a, $\mathrm{CL}(a)$ denotes the number of columns strictly left of a, and $\mathrm{CR}(a)$ denotes the number of columns strictly to the right of a. Also, to be clear, by lower right quadrant we mean the boxes in the array from §2.2 which are in positions (i, j) where $\mathrm{row}(i), \mathrm{col}(j) > 0$, and similarly for upper left quadrant. In calculations below we use the following simplification:

$$\mathrm{RA}(a)\mathrm{CL}(a) - \mathrm{RB}(a)\mathrm{CR}(a) = \frac{1}{2}((n-1)\,\mathrm{col}(a) + (l-1)\,\mathrm{row}(a)).$$

Now we turn our attention to the shift S_η. Recall that $\eta = \frac{1}{2}\eta_1 + \frac{1}{2}\eta_2$ where

$$\eta_1 = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi \\ \alpha|_{\mathfrak{t}^e} \in \Phi^e_+}} \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2 = \sum_{\substack{1 \le i \le r \\ \beta_i|_{\mathfrak{t}^e} = 0}} \beta_i.$$

Now we calculate for $a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ that

$$\eta_1 = l(\mathrm{RB}(a) - \mathrm{RA}(a)) + \delta_{i,0}\mathrm{sgn}(i) = -l\,\mathrm{row}(a) + \delta_{i,0}\mathrm{sgn}(i).$$

where $i = \mathrm{row}(a)$. Also we calculate using the fact that $\mathrm{CL}(a) - \mathrm{CR}(a) = \mathrm{col}(a)$ to get that

$$\eta_2(f_{a,a}) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{col}(a) & \text{if } \mathrm{row}(a) \neq 0; \\ \mathrm{col}(a) - \epsilon & \text{if } \mathrm{row}(a) = 0, \text{ and } \mathrm{col}(a) > 0; \\ \mathrm{col}(a) + \epsilon & \text{if } \mathrm{row}(a) = 0, \text{ and } \mathrm{col}(a) < 0. \end{cases}$$

Now we are ready to calculate $\gamma(f_{a,a}) + \eta(f_{a,a})$. If a is in the lower right quadrant then we calculate using the above results to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(f_{a,a}) + \eta(f_{a,a}) &= \frac{1}{2}((n-1)\,\mathrm{col}(a) + (l-1)\,\mathrm{row}(a)) - \epsilon \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(-l\,\mathrm{row}(a) + \epsilon) + \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{col}(a) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(-\epsilon + n\,\mathrm{col}(a) - \mathrm{row}(a)). \end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations show that if a is in the bottom half of the middle column then

$$\gamma(f_{a,a}) + \eta(f_{a,a}) = \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon + n\,\mathrm{col}(a) - \mathrm{row}(a)),$$

if a is in the right half of the middle row then

$$\gamma(f_{a,a}) + \eta(f_{a,a}) = \frac{1}{2}(-\epsilon + n\,\mathrm{col}(a) - \mathrm{row}(a)),$$

and if a is in the upper right then

$$\gamma(f_{a,a}) + \eta(f_{a,a}) = \frac{1}{2}(-\epsilon + n\,\mathrm{col}(a) - \mathrm{row}(a)).$$

So in all cases we have that

$$S_{-\eta}(S_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}+\rho_p))) = \begin{cases} s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}) + \frac{i}{2} & \text{if } p \neq 0; \\ s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}) + \frac{i}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} & \text{if } p = 0,\ i \neq 0; \\ s_{i,i}(e_{p,p}) & \text{if } p, i = 0. \end{cases}$$

□

Let $E_i^{(r)}$ denote the rth elementary symmetric function in

$$\{f_{a,a} + \frac{\mathrm{row}(a)}{2} \mid a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}, \mathrm{row}(a) = i, \mathrm{col}(a) \in \mathcal{I}_l\}.$$

Recall the definition of ω_r from (2.27)

Lemma 5.9. *Let $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ If $i > 0$, and l is even then*

$$S_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega_r)) = E_i^{(r)}.$$

If $i \geq 0$ and l is odd then

$$S_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega_r)) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-2\epsilon)^i E_i^{(r-i)}.$$

Proof. If l is even then by Lemma 5.7, (5.6), and Lemma 5.8 we have that

$$S_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega(u)) = s_{i,i}(u + e_{1-l,1-l} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{l-1,l-1} + i/2) \tag{5.8}$$

so the lemma holds in this case.

Now we consider the l odd case. Let

$$P_i(u) = s_{i,i}(u + e_{1-l,1-l} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{-2,-2} + i/2) \\ \times s_{i,i}(u + e_{0,0} + i/2 - \epsilon/2) s_{i,i}(u + e_{2,2} + i/2) + \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{l-1,l-1} + i/2),$$

and

$$Q_i(u) = s_{i,i}(u + e_{1-l,1-l} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{-2,-2} + i/2) \\ \times s_{i,i}(e_{0,0} + i/2 - \epsilon/2) s_{i,i}(u + e_{2,2} + i/2) + \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{l-1,l-1} + i/2).$$

So

$$S_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega(u)) = P_i(u) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r} Q_i(u).$$

Observe that $P_i(u) = P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}P_i''(u)$ and $Q_i(u) = Q_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}P_i''(u)$ where

$$P_i'(u) = s_{i,i}(u + e_{1-l,1-l} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{-2,-2} + i/2) \\ \times s_{i,i}(u + e_{0,0} + i/2) s_{i,i}(u + e_{2,2} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{l-1,l-1} + i/2), \tag{5.9}$$

$$P_i''(u) = s_{i,i}(u + e_{1-l,1-l} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{-2,-2} + i/2) \\ \times s_{i,i}(u + e_{2,2} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{l-1,l-1} + i/2),$$

and

$$Q_i'(u) = s_{i,i}(u + e_{1-l,1-l} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{-2,-2} + i/2) \\ \times s_{i,i}(e_{0,0} + i/2) s_{i,i}(u + e_{2,2} + i/2) \dots s_{i,i}(u + e_{l-1,l-1} + i/2).$$

Also observe that

$$P_i''(u) + \frac{1}{u}Q_i'(u) = \frac{1}{u}P_i'(u).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} P_i(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}Q_i(u) &= P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}P_i''(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}Q_i'(u) + \frac{1}{4u}P_i''(u) \\ &= P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}P_i'(u) + \frac{1}{4u}P_i''(u) \\ &= P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}P_i(u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} S_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega(u))) &= P_i(u) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u) \\ &= P_i(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}Q_i(u) + \sum_{r=2}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u) \\ &= P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}P_i(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u) \\ &= P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}\left(P_i(u) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u)\right). \end{aligned}$$

So we have that

$$P_i(u) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u) = P_i'(u) - \frac{\epsilon}{2u}\left(P_i(u) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u)\right),$$

and solving this equation for

$$P_i(u) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}Q_i(u)$$

gives that

$$S_{-\eta} \circ \pi_{-\gamma}(s_{i,i}(\omega(u))) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty}(-2\epsilon u)^{-r}P_i'(u), \tag{5.10}$$

which implies the lemma. □

Now we explain how irreducible highest weight $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules under the BGK highest weight theory are related to the irreducible highest weight $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules from Theorem 1.2. To each skew-symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux we associate an element of $\mathfrak{t}^*$ in the following way. For each $A = (a_{i,j})_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n, j\in\mathcal{I}_l} \in \mathrm{Tab}_{n,l}$ we define the weight

$$\lambda_A = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{I}_{nl}\cap\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} a_{\mathrm{row}(b),\mathrm{row}(b)}\epsilon_b \in \mathfrak{t}^*.$$

Under this association, $\mathfrak{t}^* = \mathrm{Tab}_{n,l}$, and $\mathfrak{t}^*/W_0 = \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$. Let Λ_A denote the one-dimensional $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$-module obtained by lifting the one-dimensional $S(\mathfrak{t})^{W_0}$-module corresponding to λ_A through $\xi_{-\eta}$.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $A \in \mathrm{Row}_{n,l}$. Then $L(A) \cong L(\Lambda_A, \mathfrak{q})$.*

Proof. First note that $L(A)$ is a BGK-highest weight module, since if v is a highest weight vector for $L(A)$ then $s_{i,j}(\omega_r)v = 0$ when $i < j$ and $s_{i,i}(u^{-l}\omega(u))v = \mu_i(u)$ for some $\mu_i(u) \in 1 + u^{-1}\mathbb{C}[[u^{-1}]]$. Next by conferring with the definition of $L(A)$ in §1, (2.28), (5.8), (5.9), and (5.10) we see that the action of $s_{i,i}(u^{-l}\omega(u))$ on the highest weight vector for $L(A)$ and on the the highest weight vector for $L(\Lambda_A, \mathfrak{q})$ are the same. Thus the theorem follows from [BGK, Theorem 4.5]. $\square$

6. Action of the Component Group C

In this section we show how to explicitly calculate the action of the component group $C = C_G(e)/C_g(e)^\circ = C_G(e,h,f)/C_G(e,h,f)^\circ$ on the set of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules. Here $C_G(e,h,f)$ denotes the centralizer of the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e,h,f) in the adjoint group G of $\mathfrak{g}$. Recall Losev's near classification of finite dimensional irreducible representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ from the introduction: there exists a surjective map

$$\dagger : \mathrm{Prim}_{\mathrm{fin}} U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Prim}_{\overline{G.e}} U(\mathfrak{g}),$$

and the fibers of this map are precisely C-orbits.

In our special cases we can calculate explicitly the action of C on the set of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules, and therefore on $\mathrm{Prim}_{\mathrm{fin}} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. By [C, Chapter 13] the only cases where C is not trivial are the cases when $\epsilon = -$, and n and l are both even; so unless otherwise indicated *we assume this for the rest of this section.*

Recall that in §2.2 we introduced an $n \times l$ rectangular array to specify coordinates. Now we claim that

$$c = \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{row}(a) \notin \{\pm 1\}}} e_{a,a} + \sum_{\substack{a,b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) \\ \mathrm{row}(a) = 1 \\ \mathrm{row}(b) = -1}} e_{a,b} + e_{b,a}$$

generates C. To see this note that conjugating with c simply transposes each pair of indices $a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ where $\mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b), \mathrm{row}(a) = 1, \mathrm{row}(b) = -1$. Since this is an even number of transpositions, we have that $\det c = 1$. It is also clear that $c.J^-.c = J^-$ (recall that $\mathfrak{g}$ is defined with J^- in (2.4)) since for $a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ we have that $c.e_{-a,a}.c = e_{-b,b}$ and $c.e_{a,-a}.c = e_{b,-b}$ for some $b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Thus we have that $c \in G$. Furthermore, $c.h.c = h$ (see (2.8) for the definition of h) since for $a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ $c.e_{a,a}.c = e_{b,b}$ for some b such that $\mathrm{col}(b) = \mathrm{col}(a)$. Next note $c.e.c = e$ (see (2.6) for the definition of e) since for $a, b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl}$ such that $\mathrm{row}(a) = \mathrm{row}(b), \mathrm{col}(a) + 2 = \mathrm{col}(b)$, $c.f_{a,b}.c = f_{a,b}$ if $\mathrm{row}(a) \notin \{\pm 1\}$, and if $\mathrm{row}(a) = 1$ and $\mathrm{col}(b) \geq 1$ then $c.f_{a,b}.c = f_{a',b'}$ where $\mathrm{col}(a') = \mathrm{col}(a), \mathrm{row}(a') = -1$ and $\mathrm{col}(b') = \mathrm{col}(b), \mathrm{row}(b') = -1$. So we have that $c \in C_G(e,h,f)$. Next we show that $c \notin C_G(e,h,f)^\circ$. By [J, §3.8] we have that $C_G(e,h,f) \cong O_n(\mathbb{C})$. Next observe that $C_G(h) \cong GL_n(\mathbb{C})^{\times l/2}$ (confer (2.10)), and that the projection of c into any of these copies of $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ has determinant -1, thus $c \notin C_G(e,h,f)^\circ$. Therefore $C = \langle c \rangle$.

To understand the action of C on the set of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules, we calculate the action of C on $\{\mathrm{pr}\, s_{i,j}(\omega(u)) \,|\, i,j \in \mathcal{I}_n\}$. Recall the definition of $s_{i,j}$ from (2.21). Note that $c.s_{i,j}(e_{p,p}) = s_{i',j'}(e_{p,p})$ where $i' = i$ if $i \notin \{\pm 1\}$, $i' = -i$ otherwise. Thus $c.\,\mathrm{pr}\, s_{1,1}(\omega(u)) = \mathrm{pr}\, s_{-1,-1}(\omega(u))$, and $c.\,\mathrm{pr}\, s_{i,i}(\omega(u)) = \mathrm{pr}\, s_{i,i}(\omega(u))$

for $i \notin \{\pm 1\}$. Since by Theorem 2.3 $\kappa_l(S_{i,j}(u) = \mu(s_{i,j}(\omega(u)))$, we see that the action of c on the $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module $L(A)$ is the same as the action of ψ.

We can now prove Theorem 1.3:

Proof. We have that $L(A) = L(A^+) = L(\bar{\mu}(u))$ as Y_n^+-modules where $\mu_i(u) = (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}(1 + c_{i,-l}u^{-1})(1 + c_{i,2-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{i,l}u^{-1})$ are given from (4.1). Since $\mu_i(u)$ must be a polynomial of degree at most k, we must also have for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ that $c_{i,k} = \frac{1}{2}$ for some k. After re-indexing we may assume that $c_{1,0}$ is the $\sharp'$-special element of $(c_{1,-l}, \dots, c_{1,l})$. By Theorem 3.18 $L(\bar{\mu}_(u))^\sharp = L((\mu_1^\sharp(u), \mu_2(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u)))$, where $\mu_1^\sharp(u) = (1 + \frac{1}{2}u^{-1})^{-1}(1 + c_{1,-l}u^{-1}) \dots (1 + (1 - c_{1,0})u^{-1}) \dots (1 + c_{1,l}u^{-1})$. So the skew symmetric $n \times l$ tableaux $B = (b_{i,j})$ associated to $L((\mu_1^\sharp(u), \mu_2(u), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(u)))$ by (4.1) satisfies $b_{1,0} = -1/2 + (1 - c_{1,0}) = -1/2 + (1 - (a_{1,0} + 1/2)) = -a_{1,0}$, and $b_{i,j} = a_{i,j}$ for all $(i, j) \neq (\pm 1, 0)$. $\square$

Throughout this paper G denotes the adjoint group associated to $\mathfrak{g}$. It will be useful in future work to consider the action of the group $C' = C_{O_{nl}(\mathbb{C})}(e, h, f)/C_{O_{nl}(\mathbb{C})}(e, h, f)^\circ$ on the set of finite dimensional irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-modules in the case when $\epsilon = +$ and n is even and l is odd. In these cases, $C' \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ and is generated by c where

$$c = \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{row}(a) \notin \{\pm 1\}}} e_{a,a} + \sum_{\substack{a,b \in \mathcal{I}_{nl} \\ \mathrm{col}(a) = \mathrm{col}(b) \\ \mathrm{row}(a) = 1 \\ \mathrm{row}(b) = -1}} e_{a,b} + e_{b,a}.$$

As before, the action of c on a finite dimensional $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$-module $L(A)$ is the same as the action of the Y_n^+-automorphism ψ, and so we obtain the following theorem, whose proof is essentially the same as the proof for Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that n is even l is odd integers and $\epsilon = +$. Let $A = \mathrm{Std}_{n,l}^+$, and let $L(A)$ denote the corresponding finite dimensional irreducible representation of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Then the $\sharp$-special element of $(a_{-1,l-1}, a_{-1,l-3}, \dots, a_{-1,l-1})$ is defined; let a denote the $\sharp$-special element of this list. Let c denote the generator of C'. Then $c.L(A) = L(B)$ where $B \in \mathrm{Std}_{n,l}^+$ has the same rows as A, except with one occurrence of a replaced with $-a$ in row -1, and one occurrence of $-a$ replaced with a in row 1.*

REFERENCES

[B1] J.Brown, Twisted Yangians and finite W-algebras, *Transform. Groups* **14** (2009), 87–114, `arXiv:0710.2918`.

[BB] J. Brown and J. Brundan, Elementary invariants for centralizers of nilpotent matrices, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **86** (2009), 1–15, `math.RA/0611024`.

[BruG] J. Brundan and S. Goodwin, Good grading polytopes, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **94** (2007), 155–180, `math.QA/0510205`.

[BroG] J. Brown and S. Goodwin, Representation Theory of symplectic and orthogonal finite W-algebras corresponding to even multiplicity nilpotent elements, in preparation.

[BGK] J. Brundan, S. Goodwin and A. Kleshchev, Highest weight theory for finite W-algebras, *Int. Math. Res. Notices* (2008), `arXiv:0801.1337v1`.

[BK1] J. Brundan and A. Kleshchev, Shifted Yangians and finite W-algebras, *Adv. Math.* **200** (2006), 136–195, `math.QA/0407012`.

[BK2] J. Brundan and A. Kleshchev, Representations of shifted Yangians and finite W-algebras, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **196** no. 918 (2008), `arXiv:math.RT/0508003`.

[BV] D. Barbash and D.Vogan, Primitive ideals and orbital integrals in complex classical groups, *Math. Ann.* **259** (1982), 153–199.

[C] R. W. Carter, *Finite groups of Lie type: conjugacy classes and complex characters*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 1985.

[DK] A. De Sole and V. Kac, Finite vs affine W-algebras, *Jpn. J. Math.* **1** (2006), 137–261, `math-ph/0511055`.

[D^{3}HK] A. D'Andrea, C. De Concini, A. De Sole, R. Heluani and V. Kac, Three equivalent definitions of finite W-algebras, appendix to [DK].

[Dr] V. G. Drinfeld, A new realization of Yangians and quantized affine algebras, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **36** (1988), 212–216.

[EK] P. Elashvili and V. Kac, Classification of good gradings of simple Lie algebras, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* **213** (2005), 85–104, `math-ph/0312030`.

[GG] W. L. Gan and V. Ginzburg, Quantization of Slodowy slices, *Int. Math. Res. Notices* **5** (2002) 243–255, `math.RT/0105225`.

[Gi] V. Ginzburg, Harish-Chandra bimodules for quantized Slodowy slices, `arXiv:0807.0339`.

[Go] S. Goodwin, Translation for finite W-algebras, `arXiv:0908.2739v1`.

[GRU] S. Goodwin, G. Roehrle, and G. Ubly, On 1-dimensional representations of finite W-algebras associated to simple Lie algebras of exceptional type, `arXiv:0905.3714v2`

[J] J. C. Jantzen, *Nilpotent orbits in representation theory*, Prog. Math **228** (2004).

[K] B. Kostant, On Whittaker vectors and representation theory, *Inventiones Math.* **48** (1978), 101–184.

[KRW] V. Kac, S. Roan, and M. Wakimoto, Quantum Reduction for Affine Superalgebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **241** (2003), 307–342, `math-ph/0302015`.

[Lo1] I. Losev, Quantized symplectic actions and W-algebras, `math.RT/0707.3108`.

[Lo2] I. Losev, Finite dimensional representations of W-algebras, `arXiv:0807.1023v1`.

[Lo3] I. Losev, On the structure of the category $\mathcal{O}$ for W-algebras, `arXiv:0812.1584`.

[Lo4] I. Losev, 1-dimensional representations and parabolic induction for W-algebras, preprint, `arXiv:0906.0157`.

[Ly] T. E. Lynch, *Generalized Whittaker vectors and representation theory*, Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1979.

[M] A. Molev, Finite-dimensional irreducible representations of twisted Yangians, *J. Math. Phys.* **39** (1998), 5559-5600, `arXiv:q-alg/9711022`.

[MNO] A. Molev, M. Nazarov and G. Olshanskii, *Yangians and classical Lie algebras*, Russian Math. Surveys **51** (1996), 205–282.

[P1] A. Premet, Special transverse slices and their enveloping algebras, *Adv. Math.* **170** (2002), 1–55.

[P2] A. Premet, Enveloping algebras of Slodowy slices and the Joseph ideal, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **9** (2007), 487–543, `math.RT/0504343`.

[P3] A. Premet, Commutative quotients of finite W-algebras, `arXiv:0809.0663`.

[PPY] D. Panyushev, A. Premet, and O. Yakimova, On symmetric invariants of centralisers in reductive Lie algebras, *J. Algebra* **313** (2007), 343–391, `math.RT/0610049`.

[R] E. Ragoucy, Twisted Yangians and folded W-algebras, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **16** 13 (2001), 2411–2433, `math.QA/0012182`.

[Sk] S. Skryabin, A category equivalence, Appendix to [P1].

School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

E-mail address: `brownjs@maths.bham.ac.uk`